

t^{α}

τ^{α}

i^{α}

i^{α}

A HISTORY OF BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA

BY

ROBERT WILLIAM ROGERS

PH.D. (LEIPZIG), D.D., LL.D., F.R.G.S., PROFESSOR IN DREW
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, MADISON, NEW JERSEY

THIRD EDITION

IN TWO VOLUMES
VOLUME II



NEW YORK: EATON & MAINS
CINCINNATI: JENNINGS & PYE

Copyright, 1900, by

EATON & MAINS

NEW YORK

All Rights Reserved

R 63 h
1912
45

CONTENTS.

BOOK III: THE HISTORY OF ASSYRIA.

CHAPTER I.

THE BEGINNINGS OF ASSYRIA.

	PAGE
The settlers of Assyria came from Babylonia	1
The earliest rulers called <i>Ishakku</i>	2
Bel-Kapkau prince of Asshur 1700 B. C.	3
Bel-bani ; Thutmosis III invades Asia	4
Karaindash and Asshur-bel-nisheshu	5
Puzur-Asshur, Asshur-nadin-akhe, and Asshur-uballit	6
Muballitat-Sheru'a marries king of Babylon	7
A letter of Asshur-nballit to Amenophis IV.	8
Bel-nirari and Pudi-ilu, about 1360	9
Adad-nirari I, about 1345 B. C.	10
Contests with Kurigalzu II and Nazi-Maruttash	11
The great conquests of Shalmaneser I	12
The building of Calah ; Tukulti-Ninib king 1290	13
He conquers Babylon	14
His was the most brilliant reign up to this time	15
Assyrian progress checked by Babylonian rebellion	16
Asshurnazirpal I, Asshur-narara, and Nabu-daian	17
Bel-kudur-usur, Ninib-apal-esarra, Asshur-dan, and Mutakkil-Nusku	18
Asshur-rish-ishi, about 1140 B. C.	19
His successor Tiglathpileser I	20

CHAPTER II.

TIGLATHPILESER I AND HIS SONS.

	PAGE
Tiglathpileser I, the grand monarch of western Asia	21
The Mushkê a menace to Assyria	22
Tiglathpileser conquers them	23
And establishes supremacy over Kummukh	24
Invasion of the lands of Shubari, Alzi, and Purukhumzi .	25
Campaigns against Kharia and Qurkhi	26
Invasion of the lands of Nairi	27
Sini of Daiyaëni	28
The king's boasts of his conquests	29
His building enterprises	30
End of his reign	31
Estimate of his success	32
Asshur-bel-kala and Shamshi-Adad	33, 34

CHAPTER III.

INCREASE OF ASSYRIAN POWER OVER BABYLONIA.

The dynasty of the Sea Lands; Sibar-shikhu (1074–1057)	35
Ea-mukin-zer to Silanim-shukamuna	36
The Kassite influence in this dynasty	37
Appearance of the Chaldeans; Nabu-ukin-abli	38
Developments in Syria and Palestine	39
Migrations of the Aramaeans	40
Their settlements and progress in commerce	41
The Hebrew conquest of Palestine	42
Assyria between 1050 and 950 B. C.	43
Tiglathpileser II, Asshur-dan II, and Adad-nirari II .	44
Tukulti-Ninib II, 880–865	45

CHAPTER IV.

REIGN OF ASSHURNAZIRPAL.

The beginning of the reign of Asshurnazirpal	46
Historical material of his reign	47
Conquests in the land of Nimme	48

CONTENTS.

v

	PAGE
Invasion of Qurkhi of Betani	49
Aramæan communities along the Euphrates	50
The surrender of Bit-Khalupe	51
Revolt of Khula	52
The rebuilding of Tuskha	53
Uprising of Zab-Dadi (882)	54
The collection of tribute as a military necessity	55
Its careful gathering	56
The great westward campaign of 879	57
Preparations to restore the temple in Sippar	58
Further revolts among the Aramæans	59
Asshurnazirpal founds new cities on the Euphrates	60
Destruction of Kap-rabi	61
The success attained in compelling tribute paying	62
Character of the Assyrian army	63
The Hittite city of Carchemish entered	64
The state of Patin; Lubarna	65
Invasion of the far west	66
The west sends presents to the Assyrian conqueror	67
Asshurnazirpal on Mount Amanus	68
The final campaigns of his reign	69
Character of Assyrian building	70
Canal building; end of reign	71

CHAPTER V.

SHALMANESER II TO ASSHUR-NIRARI II.

Inscriptions of Shalmaneser II	72
His long series of campaigns under personal command	73
Rebellion in Bit-Adini	74
A union for defense in the west	75
Shalmaneser's account of his western campaign	76, 77
The course of the campaign to Qarqar	78
The battle of Qarqar	79
Second invasion of the west in 849	80
The invasion in 846 and again in 842	81
Jehu pays tribute to Shalmaneser	82
The comparative failure of these western invasions	83

	PAGE
Campaigns into Urartu (Chaldia)	84
The defeat of Aramê of Chaldia	85
Chaldia invaded again in 833 and 829	86
Campaigns in Namri	87
Conquests in Khubushkia	88
Interference in Babylonia	89
Assyrian protectorate over Babylonia	90
Rebellion at the close of Shalmaneser's reign	91
Shamshi-Adad becomes king	92
Successful campaign in Nairi	93
Campaigns west, north, and south	94
War with Babylonia	95
Adad-nirari III king	96
Campaigning as far as the Caspian Sea	97
Attempts to assimilate Babylonia with Assyria	98
Survey of his reign	99
Shalmaneser III king	100
Asshur-dan III king	101
Rebellions; the eclipse of 763	102
Reign of Asshur-nirari III, peaceful decadence	103

CHAPTER VI.

THE REIGNS OF TIGLATHPILESER III AND SHALMANESER IV.

Change wrought by rebellion of 746	104
Character and training of Tiglathpileser III	105
His humble origin	106
Destruction of his inscriptions by Esarhaddon	107
His first campaign directed against Babylonia	108
Continuous victories in Babylonia	109
New administration of Babylonia	110
Babylonia completely subjected to Assyria	111
Victories east of Assyria	112
Great difficulties in Urartu	113
Sarduris II king of Chaldia, and his conquests	114
Conquered by Tiglathpileser III	115
Effect of this Assyrian success	116

CONTENTS. vii

	PAGE
Reduction of Arpad	117
Attempts to win back Nairi	118
Azariah of Judah begins a new confederation	119
Menahem of Samaria surrenders to Tiglathpileser	120
Conquest of Syria	121
Aramaean communities rebel and are conquered by their governors	122
Renewed attack upon Chaldia	123
Western campaign in 734	124
Gaza taken	125
Invasion of hill country of Palestine	126
Opportunity for new western alliance	127
Perplexities of Ahaz	128
Conquest of part of Samaria	129
Rezin defeated; Arabia invaded	130
Damascus taken in 732	131
Reign of Nabonassar in Babylonia	132
Invasion of Babylonia in 731	133
Ukinzer retires to Sapia	134
Sapia taken and Ukinzer deposed	135
Tiglathpileser III proclaimed king of Babylon in 728	136
End of his reign	137
Estimate of his ability and character	138
Shalmaneser IV becomes king	139
Changes in Palestine during the previous reign	140, 141
The situation in Egypt	142
Hope in Israel for Egyptian alliance	143
Hoshea refuses tribute in 725	144
Shalmaneser invades Samaria	145
Siege of the city; end of his reign	146, 147

CHAPTER VII.

THE REIGN OF SARGON II.

Sargon II, king and usurper	148
His great problems	149
The fall of Samaria in 722	150
Colonization in Samaria	151

	PAGE
Merodach-baladan takes Babylonia	152
Sargon makes unsuccessful campaign against him	153
Rebellion in the west in Hammath	154
Gaza and Samaria join in it	155
Victory over confederates at Raphia	156
Rebellions in the north	157
Carchemish becomes an Assyrian province	158
Attack on Urartu in 716	159
Rusas of Chaldia the chief object of the campaign	160
Which is only partially successful	161
Invasion of western Media	162
Increasing success over Rusas	163
Expedition into Arabia	164
Campaign against Rusas begun again	165
Argistis II king of Chaldia	166
Small undertakings in Media and in Tabal	167
Destruction of Melid	168
Conquest of Ashdod, Gath, and Ashdudimmu	169
Survey of the first part of the reign	170
Merodach-baladan and his difficulties in Babylonia	171, 172
Sargon looked to by Babylonians as a deliverer	173
Sargon invades Babylonia	174
And is proclaimed <i>shakkanak</i> on New Year's Day, 709	175
Campaign against Merodach-baladan	176
Babylonia pacified ; the governor of Que attacks the Mushkê	177
Success against the Mushkê ; Urartu revives	178
Sargon's last campaign	179
Building operations	180
Survey of his reign	181, 182

CHAPTER VIII.

THE REIGN OF SENNACHERIB.

Beginning of his reign ; authorities	183
The situation in Babylonia	184
His determination to set aside Babylonian pride	185

CONTENTS.

ix

PAGE

The Babylonian people refuse to acknowledge him as legitimate king	186
Marduk-zakir-shunnu and Merodach-baladan	187
Embassy to Hezekiah	188
Sennacherib's invasion of Babylonia	189
Campaign against Ellipi	190
The great invasion of the west in 701	191
The political situation in Judah	192
The Ethiopian dynasty in Egypt	193
A rebellion against Assyria begins in Ekron	194
Sennacherib attacks the Phœnician cities	195
Most of Syria submits	196
The fall of Ashkelon, Beth-Dagon, and Joppa	197
Battle with the Egyptians at Altaku	198
The fortified cities of Judah taken	199
The humiliation of Hezekiah	200
Negotiations between the Assyrians and the Jews	201
The advance of Tirhaqa	202
Destruction of Sennacherib's army	203
His failure to capture Jerusalem	204
Disturbances begin again in Babylonia	205
Death of Merodach-baladan	206
Further troubles in Babylonia	207
Elamites invade Babylonia	208
Mushezib-Marduk king of Babylon in 692	209
The battle of Khalulé	210
Destruction of Babylon in 689	211, 212
The folly and the sadness of this act	213
Arabia invaded again	214
Estimate of Sennacherib's reign	215

CHAPTER IX.

THE REIGN OF ESARHADDON.

Beginning of his reign ; authorities	216
Proclaimed <i>shakkanak</i> of Babylon	217
Difficulty of learning the order of events in his reign ; determines to rebuild Babylon	218

	PAGE
Castigation of the Chaldeans	219
Punishment of Bit-Dakkuri	220
Reduces the Gambuli to subjection	221
Invasion of the west	222
A new confederation opposes him	223
Sidon destroyed	224
The booty of the city	225
Tyre also attacked and besieged	226
But the city could not be taken	227
The campaign extended into Palestine	228
The first invasion of Egypt in 673	229
Memphis plundered and destroyed	230
Reorganization of the country	231
Melukhkha and Arabi punished	232
A king and queen in Arabi as joint rulers	233
Indo-European migrations	234
Esarhaddon's victory over Ishpakai	235
The Indo-Europeans invade Media	236
Expedition to help Median princes unsuccessful	237
The nomadic immigrants overspread the country east of Assyria	238
The Scythians	239
The great danger to Assyria of this migration	240
A rebellion in Assyria ; campaign in Egypt	241
Esarhaddon provides by will for the succession	242
Esarhaddon dies in 668	243
The great success of his reign	244, 245

CHAPTER X.

THE REIGN OF ASSHURBANAPAL.

Asshurbanapal ; authorities for his reign	246
His inscriptions beautifully written	247
Difficulty of ascertaining the order of events	248
Narrative of Esarhaddon's third expedition to Egypt	249
Asshurbanapal occupies Memphis	250
Ferocity of Asshurbanapal in Egypt	251
Tanut-Amon (Tandamani) seizes Thebes	252

CONTENTS.

xi

	PAGE
But is conquered by the Assyrians	253
Impossibility of holding Egypt	254
Campaign against Tyre	255
Gyges of Lydia and his dealings with Asshurbanapal .	256
Invasion of the land of Man	257
The sons of Gagi; Elam	258
Asshurbanapal shows favor to certain Elamites . .	259
Insurrection among the Gambuli	260
Shamash-shum-ukin's rule in Babylon	261
His ambition for independence	262
Starts numerous rebellions against Assyria . . .	263
Plots revealed to Asshurbanapal	264
Asshurbanapal laments his brother's unfaithfulness .	265
And receives a favorable omen for himself . . .	266
Elamite support withdrawn from the Babylonians .	267
Asshurbanapal's terrible punishment of the Babylonians	268
Also punishes Elam	269
For the assistance given to Nabu-bel-shume . . .	270
Dur-Undasi taken; Ummalaldash escapes	271
Immense plunder secured	272
Elam yields to superior force	273
The folly of this destruction of Elam	274
Punishment of Arabians	275
New alliances against the Assyrians	276
Peaceful relations with Urartu	277
Building operations	278
The collection of the great library	279
The glory and the failure of his reign	280, 281, 282

CHAPTER XI.

THE FALL OF ASSYRIA.

Asshur-etyl-ili-ukinni king of Assyria	283
His poor building work; meager knowledge of his reign	284
Sin-shum-lishir; Sin-shar-ishkun	285
Authorities for the events of his reign	286

	PAGE
He invades Babylonia	287
The Manda	288
Advance of the Manda against Nineveh	289
The plunder of Nineveh as a reward for its enemies	290
The siege of Nineveh by the Manda	291
The city taken and plundered	292
The complete destruction of the city	293
The division of its territory	294, 295

BOOK IV: THE HISTORY OF THE CHALDEAN EMPIRE.

CHAPTER I.

THE REIGN OF NABOPOLASSAR.

Asshurbanapal and Kandalamu the same person	297
The beginning of a new revolt in Babylonia	298
The Assyrians still hold part of Babylonia in the reign of Sin-shar-ishkun	299
The Chaldean supremacy over the Babylonians	300
The origin and first appearance of the Chaldeans . .	301
Their first experiences in government	302
Attempts to win Babylon	303
Different Chaldean communities	304
Death of Asshurbanapal offers a new opportunity . . .	305
Nabopolassar's kingdom was Chaldean	306
Abydenus's account of Nabopolassar	307
Inscriptions of Nabopolassar	308
Canal digging; Egypt under Necho II	309
Necho's expedition against Assyria	310
Battle of Megiddo; death of Josiah	311
Necho master of Palestine	312
Battle of Carchemish	313
Survey of Nabopolassar's reign	314, 315

CHAPTER II.

THE REIGN OF NEBUCHADREZZAR.

	PAGE
Nebuchadrezzar becomes king 604 B. C.	316
Jehoiakim of Judah and Jeremiah	317
The first siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadrezzar	318
The city taken; seven thousand people deported	319
Hophra, king of Egypt, incites Syria to rebellion	320
The rebellion begun in Edom, Moab, and other places	321
Embassy from these people asks Judah to join	322
The matter much discussed in Judah	323
Judah rebels; Jerusalem besieged again	324
Determination and confidence in the city; warnings	325
Jeremiah counsels submission	326
Egyptian allies driven back homeward	327
Siege begun anew	328
The city taken	329
Zedekiah punished	330
Jerusalem plundered	331
The city destroyed; population deported	332
Gedaliah governor; Jews emigrate to Egypt	333
The Chaldean policy and its success	334
The Jews survive their captivity	335
The punishment of Tyre begun	336
Chaldeans not seamen; siege of Tyre	337
Capitulation of the city	338
Nebuchadrezzar invades Egypt in 567	339
And secures heavy booty	340
His campaigns comparatively few	341
Literature of his building operations	342
Rebuilding of the walls of Babylon	343
Construction of outer wall and moat	344
The city rendered impregnable	345
New streets and massive gateways.	346
Temple reconstructions	347
Repairing of canals	348
Temples of Borsippa repaired	349

	PAGE
And the walls reconstructed	350
Death of Nebuchadrezzar; his madness	351
His record as a builder, a patron of letters and warrior	352
His piety	353

CHAPTER III.

THE LAST YEARS OF THE CHALDEAN EMPIRE.

Evil-merodach delivers Jehoiachin from prison	354
He is assassinated	355
Nergal-shar-usur follows the example of Nebuchad- rezzar	356
His work on canals and palaces	357
The brief reign of Labashi-Marduk	358
Nabonidus made king, and begins building operations	359
His peculiar interest in the foundation stones of build- ings	360
His archaeological and historical researches	361
He pays little attention to statecraft	362
But makes his son, Belshazzar, regent	363
Nabonidus rebuilds the temple of the sun at Sippar .	364
Restoration of the temple E-ulbar	365
Rebuilding of the temple of sin in Harran	366, 367
Neglect of the duties of kingship	368
The growth of the power of the Manda	369
Cyrus king of Anshan	370
Cyrus conquers Astyages	371
And then overwhelms Crœsus	372
Asia Minor a part of the Persian empire	373
Nabonidus makes no preparations for defense	374
Cyrus invades Babylonia	375, 376
Nabonidus makes provision for his gods	377
Sippar taken; Babylon entered	378
Babylon receives Cyrus with acclaim	379
Babylon a Semitic center of civilization	380
Its final end	381

APPENDIX.

A.

LITERATURE.

	PAGE
Excavations and Decipherment	383
Histories of Babylonia and Assyria	384
General Histories	385, 386
Bibliography	387

B.

THE DESTRUCTION OF SENNACHERIB'S ARMY.

The Egyptian tradition as reported by Herodotus	387
-------------------------------------------------	-----

C.

THE DEFENSES OF BABYLON.

Herodotus's account of the defenses of Babylon .	388-391
Nebuchadrezzar's account	392-395
	²

A HISTORY OF BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA.

BOOK III : THE HISTORY OF ASSYRIA.

CHAPTER I.

THE BEGINNINGS OF ASSYRIA.

Of the period when the first settlers of a Semitic race entered Assyria nothing is known, but all things point to their coming from Babylonia. The oldest traditions of the Semitic peoples connect the Assyrians with the Babylonians, and the earliest titles of their rulers point to dependence upon the previous civilization in the south. We are unable to trace the political and social history of Assyria to any point at all approaching the vast antiquity of Babylonia.

There is evidence, as already seen, that the city of Nineveh was in existence at least three thousand years before Christ, but of the men who built it and reigned in it we know absolutely nothing. As in Babylonia, we are confronted in the beginnings of

Assyrian history only by a name here and there of some early ruler of whose deeds we have only the simplest note, if indeed we have any at all. The first Assyrian ruler bears the title of *Ishakku*, which seems to mean priest-prince, and implies subjection to some other ruler elsewhere. These early rulers must have been subject princes of the kings in Babylonia, for there is no evidence yet found to connect them with any other state, while their traditional connections are all with the southern kingdom. The names of several of these *Ishakke* have come down to us, but we are unhappily not able to arrange them in any definite order of chronological sequence. Apparently the first of them are Ishme-Dagan and his son, Shamshi-Adad I. The latter of these built a great temple in the city of Asshur and dedicated it to the gods Anu and Adad. We have no certain indications of the date of these rulers, but we are probably safe in the assertion that they ruled about 1830–1810 B. C.¹ After a short interval, probably, there follow two other priest-princes, whose names are Igur-Kapkahu and Shamshi-Adad II.² The names of two other *Ishakke* have also come down to us, Khallu and Irishum,³ but their date is unknown.

¹ The date rests upon a statement in the inscriptions of Tiglathpileser I. See above, vol. i, p. 326.

² There is a little inscription of Shamshi-Adad II, published I R. 6, No. 1, and republished by Winckler, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, ii, plate iii, No. 9, translated by Sehrader in *Kelinschrift. Bibl.*, i, p. 2.

³ I R. 6, No. 2; Winckler, *ibid.*, No. 10.

These six names are all that remain of the history of the early government of Assyria. At this period, about 1800 B. C., the chief city was Asshur, then and long after the residence of the ruler. There is no hint in these early texts of hegemony over other cities; though Nineveh certainly, and other cities probably, were then in existence. The population was probably small, consisting, in its ruling classes at least, of colonists from Babylonia. There may have been earlier settlers among whom the Semitic invaders found home, as there were in Babylonia when the Semites first appeared in that land, but of them we have no certainty. It is an indistinct picture which we get of these times in the temperate northern land, but it is a picture of civilized men who dwelt in cities, and built temples in which to worship their gods, and who carried on some form of government in a tributary or other subject relation to the great culture land which they had left in the south. The later Assyrian people had but faint memory of these times, and to them, as to us, they were ancient days.

At about 1700 B. C. the priest-prince ruling in Asshur was Bel-Kapkau, according to a statement of Adad-Nirari III (811-783), a later king of Assyria, while Esarhaddon would have us believe that he was himself a direct descendant of a king, Bel-bani, and, though we may put no faith in such genealogical researches, perhaps greater credence may be given the other historical statement with which the name of Bel-bani is fol-

lowed.¹ According to the historiographers of Esarhaddon, Bel-bani was the first *Ishakku* of Asshur who adopted the title of king, having received the office of king from the god Marduk himself. If there be any truth at all in these statements, we must see in Bel-bani the first king of Assyria, but the fact is empty of real meaning, whether true or not, for we know nothing of the king's personality or works.

After these names of shadowy personalities there comes a great silent period of above two hundred years, in which we hear no sound of any movements in Assyria, nor do we know the name of even one ruler.² At the very end of this period (about 1490 B. C.) all western Asia was shaken to its foundations by an Egyptian invasion. Thutmosis III,³ freed at last from the restraint of Hatshepsowet, his peace-loving sister or aunt, had swept along the Mediterranean coast to Carmel and over the spur

¹ Whatever may be thought of Esarhaddon's statements concerning Bel-bani there is at least evidence that a king of this name actually existed, for Scheil has found a tablet dated in the reign of Bel-bani and written in archaic Babylonian script (*Recueil de Travaux*, xix, p. 59).

² It is quite probable that our ignorance of this period is due simply to the fact that excavations hitherto made in Assyria have been chiefly upon sites, such as Kuyunjik and Khorsabad, famous rather in the later than in the earlier periods of Assyrian history. When Kal'ah Shergat, the site of ancient Asshur, is explored we may perhaps be able to fill out some of the *lacunae* in the earliest times.

³ Hatshepsowet, Thutmosis II, and Thutmosis III reigned together from about 1516 to 1449. It was in the twenty-second year that the advance began upon Syria, Thutmosis III being then sole ruler of Egypt. See Petrie, *History of Egypt during the XVIIth and XVIIIth Dynasties*, 3d ed., 1899, and Steindorff, *Die Blütezeit des Pharaonen Reichs*. Leipzig, 1900.

of the hill to the plain of Esdraelon. At Megiddo the allies met him in defense of Syria, if not of all western Asia, and were crushingly defeated. The echo of that victory resounded even in Assyria, and whoever¹ it was who then reigned by the Tigris made haste to send a “great stone of real lapis lazuli”² and other less valuable gifts in token of his submission. It was well for Samaria that Thutmosis was satisfied with those gifts, and led no army across the Euphrates.

Soon after the invasion of Thutmosis III we again learn the name of an Assyrian king, for about 1450 B. C. we find the Kassite king of Babylonia, Karaindash, making a treaty with the king of Assyria, whose name is given as Asshur-bel-nisheshu.³ This latter is the first king of Assyria of whom we may consider that we know anything. He claims a certain territory in Mesopotamia, and makes good his claim to it. Assyria now is clearly acknowledged by the king of Babylonia as an independent kingdom. The independence of the northern kingdom was probably achieved during the two hundred years preceding, through the weakness of the kingdom of Babylonia. It must be remembered that it was in this very period

¹ Hommel (*Dictionary of Bible*, ed. Hastings, i, p. 180) places this tribute paying in the reign of Asshur-belnisheshu or Puzur-Asshur, but this is scarcely probable. The question is purely chronological, and differences of opinion are particularly allowable.

² The quotation is from the Annals of Thutmosis III. See translation in Petrie, *op. cit.*, p. 112.

³ Synchronistic Hist., col. i, lines 1-4, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, i, pp. 194, 195. See further above, vol. i, p. 414.

that Babylonia was torn with internal dissension and fell an easy prey to the Kassites. While the Kassites were busy with the establishment of their rule over the newly conquered land the time was auspicious for the firm settling of a new kingdom in Assyria.

Shortly after, though perhaps not immediately, his successor, Puzur-Asshur, came to the throne (about 1420 B. C.). Like his predecessor, he also had dealings with the Babylonians concerning the boundary line; and beyond this fact noted by the Assyrian synchronistic tablet,¹ we know nothing of him.

After Puzur-Ashur came Asshur-nadin-akhe (it is Asshur who giveth brothers), a contemporary of Amenophis IV,² the heretic king of Egypt, with whom he had correspondence.³ A later king also records the fact that he built, or rather perhaps restored, a palace in Asshur. His reign was an era of peace, as these two facts apparently would prove, namely, the correspondence with the far-distant land of Egypt, indicating a high state of civilization, and the restoration of a palace, and not, as heretofore, a temple.

He was succeeded by his son, Asshur-uballit (Asshur has given life), about 1370 B. C., and in

¹ Col. i, lines 5-7.

² Amenophis IV ruled 1388-1365 B. C. (Petrie); according to Stein-dorff, 1392-1374.

³ No letter of his to Egypt has been preserved, but Asshur-uballit mentions the correspondence. Letter No. 9, lines 19-21, in Winckler's edition. For translation see *Tell-el-Amarna Letters*, part i, p. 31.

his reign there were stirring times. His daughter, Muballitat-Sheru'a, was married to Kara-Khardash, the king of Babylon. Herein we meet for the first time, in real form, the Assyrian efforts to gain control in Babylonia. The son of this union, Kadashman-Kharbe I, was soon upon the throne. The Babylonian people must have suspected intrigue, for they rebelled and killed the king. This was a good excuse for Assyrian intervention, for the rebels had killed the grandson of the king of Assyria. The Assyrians invaded the land, and the Babylonians were conquered, and another grandson of Asshur-uballit was placed upon the throne, under the title of Kurigalzu II.¹ This act made Babylonia at least partially subject to Assyria, but many long years must elapse before any such subjection would be really acknowledged by the proud Babylonians. They were already subject to a foreign people, the Kassites, who had indeed become Babylonians in all respects, but it would be a greater humiliation to acknowledge their own colonists, the Assyrians, a bloodthirsty people, as their masters. Asshur-uballit also made a campaign against the Shubari, a people dwelling east of the Tigris and apparently near the borders of Elam.²

Friendly relations between Assyria and Egypt were continued during his reign, and a letter³ of

¹ See above, vol. i, p. 419.

² See Delitzsch, *Paradies*, pp. 234, 235, and compare Hommel, *Geschichte*, p. 498.

³ Published by Winckler, *Der Thontafelfund von El-Amarna*, No. 9, translated in *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, v, part 1, pp. 29, 30.

his to the Egyptian king Amenophis IV has been preserved, in which occur the following sentences: "To Napkhuriya¹ . . . king of Egypt my brother: Asshur-uballit, king of Assyria, the great king thy brother. To thyself, to thy house, and to thy country let there be peace. When I saw thy ambassadors I rejoiced greatly . . . A chariot . . . and two white horses, . . . a chariot without harness, and one seal of blue stone I have sent thee as a present. These are presents for the great king." The letter then proceeds to ask very frankly for specific and very large gifts in return, and tells very clearly of the present state of the road between Egypt and Assyria.

In the reign of Asshur-uballit Assyria made a distinct advance in power and dignity, and this development continued during the reign of Asshur-uballit's son and successor, Bel-nirari (Bel-is-my-help)—about 1380 B.C. Of him two facts have come down to us, the mutual relations of which seem to be as follows: Kurigalzu II had been seated on the Babylonian throne by the Assyrians and therefore owed them much gratitude, but to assure the stability of his throne he must needs take the Babylonian rather than the Assyrian side of controversies and difficulties between the peoples. The grandson of Bel-nirari boasts concerning him that he conquered the Kassites² and in-

¹ The official name of Amenophis IV, representing the Egyptian NEFER-KHIEPRU-RA.

² IV R. 44, line 24; *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, i, p. 7.

creased the territory of Assyria. By this he must mean not the Kassite rulers of Babylonia, but rather the people from whom they had come—that is, the inhabitants of the neighboring Elamite foothills. This conquest simply carried a little further the acquisition of territory toward the east and south which had been begun by Asshur-uballit's conquest of Shubari. But these Assyrian conquests led to Babylonian jealousy and then to a conflict between Kurigalzu II and Bel-nirari, in which the latter was victorious, and this, in turn, brought about a rearrangement of the boundary line by which the two kings divided between them the disputed territory,¹ though it does not appear which was the gainer.

Again the succession to the throne passed from father to son, and Pudi-ilu (about 1360 B. C.) reigned in Asshur. He has left us only brief inscriptions,² in which he boasts of building at the temple of Shamash, probably that at the capital city. From his son we learn that he was a warrior of no mean achievements, though our geographical knowledge is not sufficient to enable us to follow his movements closely. He is represented as overrunning the lands Turuki and Nigimkhi, and conquering the princes of the land of Gutium.³ Beside these conquests to the north of the city of Asshur he also extended his borders

¹ Synchronistic History, col. i, lines 5-7.

² *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, i, pp. 2-5.

³ Inscription of Adad-nirari I, col. i, lines 16-18.

toward the southwest by the conquest of the nomad people the Sutu. From reign to reign we see the little kingdom of Asshur grow. These conquests were probably not much more than raids, nor is it likely that at so early a period a serious effort was made by the Assyrians to govern the territory overrun.¹ It was preparatory work; the peoples round about Asshur were gradually being brought to know something of its growing power. They would soon come to regard it as a mistress and consolidation would be easy. It was in similar fashion that the empire of Babylonia had grown to its position of influence.

Pudi-ilu was succeeded by his son, Adad-nirari I (about 1345 B. C.), who has left us two records, the one a bronze sword inscribed with his name and titles,² the other a considerable inscription,³ carefully dated by the eponym name, the oldest dated Assyrian inscription yet found. The latter is largely devoted to an account of the enlargement of the temple of Asshur in the capital, his wars being but slightly mentioned. In the enumeration of the lands conquered by him the countries already overrun by his predecessors are

¹ It is, however, to be noted that Assyrian colonists were settled in distant countries at a very early date. The Kappadokian tablets would seem to show that Assyrians were settled near Kaisariyeh as early as 1400 B. C.

² See *Transactions of Society of Biblical Archaeology*, iv, p. 347.

³ Published IV R. p. 39, translated by Peiser in *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, i, pp. 5, ff.

repeated—Shubari, the Kassite country, and Guti, to which he adds the land of the Lulumi. The fact that these lands needed so soon to be conquered again shows that the first conquest was little more than a raid. But this time a distinct advance was made; Adad-nirari does more than conquer. He expressly states that he rebuilt cities in this conquered territory¹ which had been devastated by the previous conquests. Here is evidence of rule rather than of ruin, and in this incident we may find the real beginnings of the great empire of Assyria. Again there were difficulties with Babylonia, and Adad-nirari fought with Kurigalzu II and with his successor, Nazi-Maruttash (about 1345 B. C.), both of whom he conquered, according to Assyrian accounts,² though the Babylonian Chronicle would give the victory to the Babylonian king, in the first case at least. In the inscription of the bronze sword Adad-nirari calls himself king of Kishshati, a title which is found earlier in an inscription of Asshur-uballit.³ He does not call himself king of Asshur at all, though this title is given by him to his father and grandfather. Apparently he seems to claim for himself a greater dignity than that of ruler merely over Asshur, else would he certainly have called himself king of Asshur, as did his predecessors. But his own description gives us no means of determining the

¹ Inscription of Adad-nirari, col. i, 3, 4.

² Synchronistic History, col. i, lines 24-31.

³ Scheil, *Recueil*, xix, p. 46.

location or the bounds of the territory which he had conquered or over which he claimed rule. When his reign closed he left Assyria and its dependencies far stronger than when he took the government in his own hands.

His son, Shalmaneser I, was his worthy successor. From his own historiographers very little has come down to us—only two broken tablets,¹ from which it is difficult to make out any connected story, but the fame of his great deeds called forth more than one mention from later kings,² and these will enable us to reconstruct the main portion of his achievements. The general direction of his conquests was toward the northwest. This would seem to imply that the policy of his father had been successful, and that the territory toward the northeast and the southeast was peacefully subject to Assyria. He pushed rather into the great territory of the valley between the Tigris and the Euphrates, and therein established colonies as a bulwark of defense against the nomadic populations of the farther north. Still farther westward the land of Musri was also subjected. This land lay north of Syria, close to Mount Amanus, and hence very near to the great Mediterranean Sea. To reach it Shalmaneser must cross

¹ Published I R. 6, No. iv., translated by Schrader, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, i, pp. 8, 9. The second is published by Lenormant, *Choix de textes*, p. 170, No. 73, and by Winckler, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, ii, p. 313, and plate No. 7.

² Especially by Asshurnazirpal (I R. 28, and III R. 4, No. 1). See Deitzsch, *Die Sprache der Kossäer*, pp. 10, ff.; Hommel, *Geschichte*, pp. 437, ff.

the Euphrates—the first time that Assyrian power had crossed the great river. Subsequent events show that the more westerly parts of the land which he conquered were not really added to the Assyrian state. As in the case of Shubari, so also in this, other invasions would be necessary. But this at least had been gained, the rapidly growing kingdom was firmly established as far as the Balikh, and perhaps even to the Euphrates beyond.

Small wonder is it that a conqueror of such prowess and an organizer of such ability should deem it necessary to build a new capital worthy of so great a kingdom. The city of Asshur was old, and its location was far south, too near the old Babylonian border. A kingdom that was growing northward and westward needed a capital more nearly central in location. Shalmaneser I determined to erect his new capital at Calah,¹ and so pitched upon a site which remained the capital of his country for centuries, and later became the southern portion of Nineveh itself. In peace as in war a man of foresight and skill, like his father, he left Assyria the greater for his living and ruling.

In the reign of his son and successor, Tukulti-Ninib (about 1290 B. C.), the irresistible progress of the Assyrian arms reached a glorious climax. There had once more arisen trouble between the two states of Assyria and Babylonia. Perhaps it was the old and vexed boundary question, which would not down; perhaps the never-forgotten rest-

¹ See above, vol. i, pp. 297, 298.

less ambition of the Assyrians to rule at Babylon. Whatever the cause or excuse Tukulti-Ninib invaded Babylonia with force sufficient to overwhelm its defenders and the imperial capital was taken. After an unexampled career of power and of civilization Babylon had fallen and the Assyrian plunderer was among her ruins. Tukulti-Ninib laid low a part of the city wall, even then massive, killed some of the defenders, and plundered the temple, carrying away into Assyria the image of the great god Marduk. This was no mere raid, but a genuine conquest of the city, which was now governed from Calah. Assyrian officers were stationed both in the north and in the south of the country. Tukulti-Ninib adopts the title of king of Sumer and Accad in addition to his former titles, king of Kishshati and king of Asshur. In his person were now united the latest Assyrian title and one of the most ancient titles in the world. The old and coveted land of Sumer and Accad, the conquest of which by Hammurabi had been the very making of his empire, was now ruled from the far north. A curious evidence of the rule of Tukulti-Ninib in Babylon itself was found by Sennacherib, probably during the second attack upon the city (689 B. C.). Tukulti-Ninib had sent to Babylon a seal inscribed with his name, and this was taken to Assyria.¹ For seven years only

¹ These facts come from a thirteen-line fragmentary inscription of Sennacherib III, R. 4, No. 2, translated by Smith, *Records of the Past*, First Series, v, pp. 85, 86. Comp. Bezold, *Übersicht*, pp. 15, 16. See above, vol. i, pp. 325, 326.

was this rule over Babylonia maintained. The Babylonians rebelled, drove out the Assyrian conqueror, and set up once more a Babylonian, Adad-shum-usur (about 1268–1239 B. C.), as king over them. When Tukulti-Ninib returned to Assyria after his unsuccessful effort to maintain his authority in the south he found even his own people in rebellion under the leadership of his son. In the civil war that followed he lost his life, and the most brilliant reign in Assyrian history up to that time was closed.

Up to this point the progress of the Assyrians had been steady and rapid. The few Semitic colonists from Babylonia had so completely overwhelmed the original inhabitants of their land that the latter made no impression on Assyrian life or history, and in this alone they had achieved more than the Babylonians, after a much longer history and with greater opportunities. We have seen how the Babylonians were influenced by the Sumerian civilization and by the Sumerian people. Afterward they were first conquered by the Kassites and then so completely amalgamated with them that they ceased to be a pure Semitic race. Thus the influences of Semitism could not be perpetuated and disseminated by the Babylonians, while, on the other hand, the Assyrians suffered no intermixture. The latter had already so gained control of the fine territory which they first invaded as to be absolute masters of it. Under them the land of Assyria had become Semitic.

More than this, they had gained sufficient influence by conquest over the older Aramaean peoples toward the southeast, between them and the Kassites and the Babylonians, as to take from the Babylonians the Semitic leadership. Their colonies in the upper Mesopotamian valley were centers of Semitic influence and stood as a great bulwark against the non-Semitic influences on the north. By crossing the Euphrates and conquering the land of Musri they had also threatened the older Semitic civilizations in Syria and Palestine. Would they be able to wrest the power from them, as they had from the eastern Aramaeans and from the Babylonians? If this could be done, the Assyrians would hold in their hands the destinies of the Semitic race. It seemed as though they were to accomplish even this, when they were suddenly checked by the successful rebellion of the Babylonians, by civil war, and by the death of their great leader. This reverse might mean their permanent overthrow if the Babylonian people still had in their veins the courage, the dash, and the rugged independence of the desert Semite. If, however, the intermixture of Sumerian and Kassite blood, not to mention lesser strains, had weakened the Semitic powers of the Babylonians, the check to Assyria might be only temporary. It is a critical day in the history of the race. The severity of the blow to Assyria is evidenced not only by the results in Babylonia, but no less by the fragmentary character of Assyrian annals for a long

time. It is, indeed, for a time difficult not only to learn the course of events in Assyria, but even the names and order of the kings. The Babylonian Chronicle¹ mentions an Assyrian king, Tukulti-Asshur-Bel, in close connection with the history of Tukulti-Ninib, but in words so obscure that his relation to the history is difficult to understand. It is altogether probable that he reigned as regent² in Assyria during the seven years in which his father was engaged in the reducing and ruling of Babylon, but of his deeds in these years we have no knowledge.

The successor of Tukulti-Ninib on the throne of Assyria was his son, Asshurnazirpal I, who had led the rebellion against him. In his reign the ruin of Assyrian fortunes which began in his father's defeat and death went rapidly on. The Babylonian king, Adad-shum-usur, felt himself strong enough to follow up the advantage already gained by the restoration of his family to power, and actually attacked Assyria, from which he was only with difficulty repulsed.

The next Assyrian kings were Asshurnarara and Nabu-daian (about 1250 B. C.), of whose reigns we know nothing, although we are able to infer from the sequel that the Assyrian power continued to wane, while the Babylonian increased. The reigns were short, and were soon succeeded

¹ P., col. iv, 12.

² This is Winckler's solution of the difficulty. Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, p. 135.

by Bel-kudur-usur and Ninib-apal-esharra, in whose day the Babylonians under the leadership of Meli-Shipak and Marduk-apal-iddina invaded Assyria and stripped the once powerful kingdom of all its southern and part at least of its northern and western conquered territory. Apparently all was lost that the Assyrian kings of the earlier day had won, and the end of Assyrian leadership had come, but the motive force of the Assyrians was not destroyed.

The successor of Ninib-apal-esharra was Asshurdan (about 1210 B. C.), and with him begins the rehabilitation of Assyrian power. He crossed the river Zab, and invading the territory which had been for some time considered Babylonian, restored a small section of it to Assyria. We know little else of his reign, but this is sufficient to mark the turning point and explain what follows. His great-grandson, Tiglathpileser, boasts of him that he reached a great age.¹ In his reign the rugged virtues of the Assyrians were preparing for the reawakening which was soon to come. Of the following reign of his son, Mutakkil-Nusku² (about 1150 B. C.), we have no information, though we are probably safe in the supposition that his father's work was continued, for we find in Babylonian history, as has been seen, no evidence of any weakening of Assyria, but rather the contrary.

¹ Prism inscription of Tiglathpileser I, col. vii, line 54.

² He is mentioned by Tiglathpileser I (Prism inscription, col. vii, lines 45-48) and has left us a brief inscription (George Smith, *Assyrian Discoveries*, pp. 142, 251).

The gain in the Assyrian progress is shown more clearly by the reign of his son, Asshur-rish-ishi (about 1140 B. C.), who is introduced to us very fittingly as “the powerful king, the conqueror of hostile lands, the subduer of all the evil.”¹ The beginning of his conquests was made by a successful campaign against the Lulumi and the Kuti, who have found mention more than once before. They must have either become independent, during the period of Assyria’s decline, or perhaps have been added to the restored Babylonian empire. Having thus made sure of the territory on the south and east, Asshur-rish-ishi was ready to meet the great and hereditary foe of Babylon. Nebuchadrezzar I was now king in Babylon, and, flushed with recent victory over a portion of Elam, was a dangerous antagonist. The issue between the kings seems to have been joined not in the old land of Babylonia south of Assyria, but in Mesopotamia, and the Assyrians were victorious. Of the other deeds of Asshur-rish-ishi we know nothing save that he restored again the temple of Ishtar in Calah.

Asshur-rish-ishi was succeeded by his son, Tiglath-pileser I (Tukulti-pal-esarra, My help is the son of Esharra—that is, My help is the god Ninib). There was therefore no break in the succession and no new dynasty begins. Nevertheless, a new period of Assyrian history really commences with the next king. With Asshur-rish-ishi ends the first

¹ *Annals of Tiglathpileser*, vii, 42–44, published I R. 15.

period of growth and decay and of renaissance. To his son he left a kingdom almost as great as Assyria had yet possessed. Tiglathpileser begins to reign with the titles of king of Kishshati and king of Asshur; the only title belonging to his ancestors which he did not possess was king of Sumer and Accad. With him we enter upon a wonderful period in the career of the Assyrian people.
₂

CHAPTER II.

TIGLATHPILESER I AND HIS SONS.

TIGLATHPILESER I (about 1120 B. C.) was the grand monarch of western Asia in his day, and the glory of his achievements was held in memory in Assyria for ages after. It is fitting that one who wrought such marvels in peace and war should have caused his deeds to be written down with care and preserved in more than one copy.¹ To his gods he ascribed the credit of his works. Their names, a formidable number, stand at the very head of the chief written memorials of his reign.

¹ The chief source of knowledge of the reign of Tiglathpileser is found in the eight-sided prism, four copies of which were found at Kalah Shergat, two in excellent preservation and two in fragments. The text is substantially the same in all the copies and is published I R. 9-16, and in Winckler, *Sammlung von Keilschrifttexten*, i, plates 1-25. It is transliterated and translated in Lotz, *Die Inschriften Tiglathpileser's I*, Leipzig, 1880, and also by Winckler, in *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, i, pp. 14-47. There is an English translation by Professor Sayee, with useful geographical notes, in *Records of the Past*, New Series, i, 92-121. This was the text used by the Royal Asiatic Society to demonstrate the correctness of the method of decipherment. See above, vol. i, pp. 194-197. Besides this fine prism there have also been preserved some fragmentary annals of the first ten years of his reign erroneously ascribed originally to Asshur-ish-ishi and published III R. 5, Nos. 1-5, and by Winckler, *Sammlung*, pp. 26-29. Notes upon portions of them are given by Lotz, *op. cit.*, pp. 193, 194, and by Bruno Messnier, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, ix, pp. 101, ff. The names and titles of the king are given in two brief texts found at the so-called grotto of Sebeneh-Su (III R. 4, No. 6; Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften am Eingange der Quellgrotte des Sebeneh-Su*, Berlin, 1885; Winckler, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, i, pp. 48, 49), and at Kalah Shergat (I R. 6, No. V; Winckler, *Sammlung*, p. 31).

Here are Asshur, the ancient patron deity of his land, "the great lord, the director of the hosts of the gods," and Bel also, and Sin, the moon god; Shamash, the sun god; Adad, the god of the air, of storms, of thunder, and rain; Ninib, "the hero;" and, last of all, the goddess Ishtar, "the firstborn of the gods," whose name was ever to resound and be hallowed in the later history of Nineveh.¹ With so great a pantheon had the people of Assyria already enriched themselves.

The annals of the king show that he planned his campaigns well and had a definite aim in each struggle against his enemies. When he ascended the throne Babylonia was too weak to interfere with his labor of building up anew the Assyrian empire, and no immediate campaign southward was therefore necessary. On the other hand, there was a threatening situation in the north and west. The nomadic tribes, established in the hill country above the Mesopotamian valley, northward of Harran, had never been really subdued, and some fresh effort had to be made to hold them in check or the integrity of the kingdom might be endangered. The tribe that was now most threatening was the Mushkê. This people was settled in the territory north of Milid, the modern Malatiyeh, on both sides of the upper waters of the Euphrates. In later times they became famous as the Moschi² of the Greeks, and the Meshech³ of the Old Testa-

¹I R. 9, 1-14.

²Herodotus, iii, 94; vii, 78.

³Gen. x, 2; Ezek. xxvii, 18; xxxviii, 2.

ment, being in both cases associated with the Tubal or Tibareni, who at this period lived toward the south and west, inhabiting a portion of the territory later known as Kappadokia. The Mushkē had crossed the Euphrates southward and possessed themselves of the districts of Alzi and Purukhumzi about fifty years before, in the period of Assyria's weakness. The Assyrians had once overrun this very territory and claimed presents for the god Asshur from its inhabitants, but it was now fully in the control of the Mushkē, and had for these fifty years been paying tribute to them, and not to the Assyrians. Feeling their strength, and unopposed by any other king, the Mushkē, to the number of about twenty thousand, in five bands, invaded the land of Kummukh. Here was indeed a dangerous situation for Assyria, for if these people were unchecked, they would not long be satisfied with the possession of this northern part of Kummukh, but would seize it all, and perhaps invade the land of Assyria itself. Trusting in Asshur, his lord, Tiglathpileser hastily assembled an army and marched against them. He must cross the rough and wild Mount Masius and descend upon his enemies among the head waters of the Tigris. How large a force of men he led in this venture we do not know, but his victory was overwhelming. Of the twenty thousand men who opposed him but six thousand remained alive to surrender and accept Assyrian rule. The others were savagely butchered, their

heads cut off, and their blood scattered over the "ditches and heights of the mountains."¹ This savagery, so clearly met here for the first time, blackens the whole record of Assyrian history to the end. It was usual in far less degree among the Babylonians, so that the ascendancy of Assyria over Babylonia is, in this light, the triumph of brute force over civilization.

Having thus overwhelmed the advance guard of the Mushkē, Tiglathpileser returns to reestablish, by conquest, the Assyrian supremacy over the southern portions of the land of Kummukh. This country was also quickly subdued and its cities wasted with fire, perhaps as centers of possible rebellion. The fleeing inhabitants crossed an arm of the Tigris toward the west and made a stand in the city of Sherishē, which they fortified for defense. The Assyrian king pursued across mountain and river, and carried by assault their stronghold, butchering the fighting men as before. The men of Kummukh had some forces from the land of Qurkhe² as allies, but these profited little, and the united forces were overwhelmed. Again the Tigris was crossed and the stronghold of Urrakhinash laid waste. Rightly appreciating the terrible danger that threatened them, the inhabitants gathered together their possessions, together with

¹ Tiglathpileser Prism inscription, i, 62-88. The phrase quoted is in line 79. Translation in *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, i, p. 19.

² "A land eastward of Diarbekir, along the northern bank of the Tigris," so Sayee, *Records of the Past*, New Series, vol. i, p. 96, note 3.

their gods, and fled “like birds”¹ into the mountain fastnesses that surrounded them. Their king realizing the hopelessness of his state, came forth to meet his conqueror and to seek some mercy at his hand. Tiglathpileser took the members of his family as hostages, and received a rich gift of bronze plates, copper bowls, and trays, and a hundred and twenty slaves, with oxen and sheep. Strangely enough he spared his life, adding complacently to the record the words: “I had compassion on him, (and) granted his life,” which hereafter was to be lived under Assyrian suzerainty. By these movements the “broad land of Kummukh” was conquered, and the Assyrian ruled at least as far as, if not beyond, Mount Masius. Great achievements these for the first year of a reign, and the next year was equally successful. It began with an invasion of the land of Shubari, which had been conquered before by Adad-nirari I, and had again rebelled, thence the king marched into the countries of Alzi and Purukhumzi, of which we heard in his first campaign, in order to lay upon them anew the old annual tribute so long unpaid to Assyria. The cities of Shubari surrendered without battle on the appearance of Tiglathpileser, and the district north of Mount Masius was all a tribute-paying land. On the return from this campaign the land of Kummukh is again devastated. The exaggeration of the king’s annals appears strongly here, for if, in

¹ The figure belongs to the annals of Tiglathpileser.

the campaign of the first year, Kummukh had been so thoroughly wasted as the king's words declare, there would certainly have been little left to destroy in the next year. This time there is added at the conclusion one sentence which did not appear before. "The land of Kummukh, in its whole extent, I subjugated and added to the territory of my land."¹ Well may such a conqueror continue in the words which immediately follow: "Tiglathpileser, the powerful king, overwhelmēr of the disobedient, he who overcomes the opposition of the wicked."² The control of the great Mesopotamian valley in its northern portion between the Tigris and the Euphrates is safely lodged in Assyrian hands.

The third year of the reign of Tiglathpileser contained no less than three campaigns. The first, against Kharia³ and Qurkhi, we cannot follow in its geographical details, and are therefore unable fully to realize its meaning and importance. It was a mountain campaign, full of toilsome ascents, and carried on with the usual savage accompaniments. In quite a different direction lay the course of the second campaign of this year. Instead of the north, it was the south that now claimed attention. The king crosses the Lower

¹ Tiglathpileser, col. iii, i, 34–35.

² *Ibid.*, lines 36–38.

³ Tiele (*Geschichte*, p. 159, Anm. 2) has joined Kharia with Lullumē, but on insufficient grounds. Streck (*Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, xiv, 160, 161) would locate it in the mountains of Bohtān, east of Kirkhu, and this, seems to fit the general situation well.

Zab River, which discharges its waters into the Tigris not far south of the ancient capital, Asshur, and conquers an inaccessible region amid the mountains of its upper courses. A third campaign again carries him to the north against Sugi, in Qurkhi, and results also in a victory, from which no less than twenty-five gods were brought back to Assyria in triumphal subjection to Anu, Adad, and Ishtar.

The great undertaking of the fourth year of the king's reign was a campaign into the lands of the Nairi.¹ By this the annals of Tiglathpileser clearly mean the lands about the sources of the Tigris and Euphrates, lying north, west, and south of Lake Van. In this territory there was as yet no Chaldian kingdom, but no less than twenty-three native kings or princes united their forces to oppose the Assyrian. There was more mountain climbing to reach them, and then they were severely punished. The kings were taken alive, and after swearing oaths of fealty to the gods of Assyria were liberated. Chariots and troops of horses, with much treasure of every kind, were taken, and a yearly tribute of twelve hundred horses and two thousand oxen was put upon the inhabitants, who were not removed from their land.² One only of these twenty-three kings—

¹ See the admirable collection of references to this territory in Streck, M., *Das Gebiet der heutigen Landschaft Armenien, Kurdistān und Westpersien nach den babylonisch-assyrischen Keilinschriften*, in *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, xiii, pp. 57, ff.

² Tiglathpileser, iv, 43; v, 21.

Sini, the king of Daiyaëni¹—refusing to surrender as the others, resisted to the last. He was therefore carried in chains to Assyria, where he probably saw reasons for submission, for he was suffered to depart alive. This episode in the king's conquests is concluded with the claim that the whole of the lands of Nairi were subdued, but later history shows clearly that further conquest was necessary. It was a great move forward in Assyria's growth into a world power to have accomplished this much. As a part of the same campaign tribute was collected from the territory about Milid, and another year of activity was ended.

By comparison with the previous four years the fifth seems a year of less result. Aramaean peoples inhabiting the Syrian wastes, west of the upper waters of the Euphrates and south of the city of Carchemish, had crossed the river into Mesopotamia. Tiglathpileses expelled them, and so again strengthened Assyrian supremacy in northern Mesopotamia as far as Carchemish. Following up his easily won victory, the king crossed the Euphrates in pursuit and laid waste six Aramaean cities at the foot of Mount Bishri.

The campaign of the next year was directed against the land of Musri,² which had already

¹ Dayaëni, known in the Chaldaean inscriptions as the kingdom "of the son of Diana," is located along the Murad-chai near Melasgerd. See Sayee, "Cuneiform Inscriptions of Van," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, xiv, p. 399; *Records of the Past*, New Series, i, p. 106, footnote 6.

² This land lay in the northwest, beyond the Euphrates, and extended southward from about Malatiyah toward the Mediterranean. Its conquest introduced Tiglathpileses to the plains of Syria.

felt the arm of Assyria in the reign of Shalmaneser I. The people of Musri were aided by allies from the land of Qumani,¹ and both lands were subjugated and a yearly tribute put upon them, after they had suffered all the horrors of the savage Assyrian method of warfare. In the language of the annals, their heads were cut off “like sheep.”

The king thus records the results of his five years of campaigns: “In all, forty-two centuries and their kings from beyond the Lower Zab (and) the border of the distant mountains to beyond the Euphrates, to the land of the Hittites and the Upper Sea² of the setting sun, from the beginning of my sovereignty until my fifth year my hand has conquered. Of one mind I made them all; their hostages I took; tribute and taxes I imposed upon them.” With this notice in the annals of Tiglathpileser ends all account of his campaigns. No other word concerning any further raids or ravages is spoken. Were it not for the Synchronistic History we should know nothing more of his prowess. The information which thus comes to us is not so full as are the notes which we have already passed in review, but it supplies what was needful to round out the circle of his march-

¹ Qumani is the district Comana in Cataonia (Delattre, *L'Asie occidentale dans les Inscriptions Assyriennes*, pp. 65, 66).

² The location of the Upper Sea is still an undecided problem. It is identified with the Black Sea (Eduard Meyer, Tiele), with Lake Van (Sehrader, Sayee), with the Gulf of Issus (George Rawlinson, Hommel), and with the Caspian (Ménant).

ing and conquering. It was improbable that a king who had conquered north, west, and east should not also find cause for attacking the coveted land of Babylonia. From the Synchronistic History¹ we learn that he twice invaded the territory of Marduk-nadin-akhe and marched even to Babylon itself, where he was styled king of the Four Quarters of the World. So ends the story of the wars of Tiglathpileser I. He had not only restored the kingdom of Assyria to the position which it held in the days of Shalmaneser and Tukulti-Ninib; he had made it still more great. Never had so many peoples paid tribute to the Assyrians, and never was so large a territory actually ruled from the Assyrian capital.

But Tiglathpileser was no less great in peace than in war. He brought back the capital of Assyria from Calah to Asshur and almost rebuilt the city, which had thus again become important. The temples of Ishtar, Adad, and Bel were rebuilt. The palaces which had fallen into ruin during the absence of the court were again restored and beautified. And then into this city thus renewed, and into this land enlarged by conquest, the king brought the wealth of the world as he had gathered it. Goats, fallow deer, and wild sheep were herded into the land. Horses in large numbers taken from conquered lands or received in yearly tribute were added to the peaceful service of agriculture. But not even here did

¹ Col. ii, lines 14-24.

the king rest. He caused trees also to be brought from great distances and planted in the land he loved.¹ It is a marvelous story of peaceful achievement, worthy of a place by the side of his overpowering success in war.

In addition to the serious work of war and peace the king found time to cultivate the wiles of a sportsman, and great are his boasts of the birds and the cattle and even the lions which he slew. This passion for sport is commemorated long afterward in an inscription of Asshurnazirpal, in which we are told that Tiglathpileser sailed in ships of Arvad upon the Mediterranean.² It follows from this that after the six campaigns, enumerated above, the king must have made another which carried him out to the Phœnician coast, where his successors were later to fight great battles and win great triumphs.

Of the conclusion of the reign of Tiglathpileser we know nothing. He probably died in peace, for he was succeeded by his son, Assur-bel-kala (about 1090 B. C.), and the latter was followed after a short reign by another son of Tiglathpileser, Shamshi-Adad I (about 1080 B. C.). So easy and unbroken a succession makes it a fair presumption that the times were peaceful. The sons were not able to bear the burden which came to them,

¹ Tiglathpileser VII, 1-35 (thereby imitating Thutmosis III).

² I R. 28, 2. Comp. translation by Peiser, in *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, i, 124. While sailing the king slew a *nakhru*, but we do not know what the word signifies. Sayce suggests "dolphin." *Early Israel and the Surrounding Nations*, p. 218.

so that there is speedily a falling off in the power and dignity of the kingdom. When we look back on the reign of Tiglathpileser and ask what of permanent value for Assyria was achieved by all his wars the answer is disappointing. He might boast that he had conquered from east to west, from the Lower Zab to the Mediterranean, and from the south to the north, from Babylonia to Lake Van, but what were these conquests, for the most part, but raids of intimidation and of plunder? He did not really extend the government of Assyria to such limits, even though in Kummukh he actually appointed Assyrian governors. Over this great territory, however, he made the name of Assyria feared, so that the lesser peoples surrendered at times without striking a blow for freedom, while the greater peoples dared not think of invading Assyrian territory. This insurance against invasion was the great gain which he brought to his country. By carrying savage war to other nations he secured for his own a peace which gave opportunity for progress in the arts. These great temples and palaces required time for their erection and time for the training of men who were skilled in the making of bricks and the working of wood. The very inscription from which we have learned the facts of his reign, a beautiful clay prism with eight hundred and nine lines of writing, bears impressive witness to a high state of civilization and an era of peace.

Of the reigns of the two sons we know almost nothing. Asshur-bel-kala maintained terms of peace with Marduk-shapik-zer-mati (about 1094–1083 B. C.), king of Babylonia, who thereby seemed to be considered an independent monarch and not subject to the Assyrians, as his predecessor had been. In this reign the capital appears to have been transferred to Nineveh,¹ and a word in the only inscription of the king which has come down to us hints at the king's control in the west.² After a short reign Asshur-bel-kala was succeeded by his brother, Shamshi-Adad, whose only work known to us was the rebuilding of the temple of Ishtar in Nineveh—another proof that the capital was now located at this city and not at Asshur.

After this reign there is another long period of silence in Assyrian history, of which we have no native monumental witnesses; a period of immense importance in the history of mankind, for it was a time not only of silence but of actual decay in the Assyrian commonwealth. As the fortunes of Assyria were at so low an ebb, the time was favorable for the growth and development of peoples elsewhere who were for a time free from the threatening of Assyrian arms. When once more

¹ This follows from an inscription of Asshur-bel-kala which was found at Kuyunjik—that is, Nineveh—which comes from a *palace* of the king. It is published I R. 6, No. V, and republished more correctly, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, April, 1892, and again translated by S. A. Strong, *Records of the Past*, New Series, vi, pp. 76–79.

² So Professor Sayee, *ibid.*, p. 78, footnote.

we come upon a period of historical writing and of great deeds in Assyria we shall find the Assyrian conquerors confronting a changed condition of affairs in the world. To the growth of new conditions elsewhere we must now address our thought for a better understanding of Assyrian movements after the silent period.

CHAPTER III.

THE INCREASE OF ASSYRIAN POWER OVER BABYLONIA.

AFTER the dynasty of Isin had ceased to rule in Babylonia, brought to an end we know not how, there arose a dynasty known to the Babylonian historiographers and chronologists as the dynasty of the Sea Lands. The territory known as the Sea Lands was alluvial land at the estuaries of the Tigris and the Euphrates upon the Persian Gulf. This fertile country, already beginning to show its growing power, was destined at a later period to exercise a great influence upon the history of Babylonia. The dynasty of the Sea Lands numbered only three kings, who reigned together but twenty-one years and five months,¹ or, as the Babylonian Chronicle has it, twenty-three years.² This variation in the time given by the two chief Babylonian authorities is instructive in its showing that the Babylonians themselves did not preserve so accurate a memory of this time as of the earlier and later periods.

The first king of the dynasty was Sibar-shipak (about 1074–1057 B. C.), of whose reign we know only that it ended disastrously, for he was slain and buried in the palace of Sargon.³

¹ King List A, col. iii.

² Chronicle B, 1.

³ Babylonian Chronicle V., lines 2 and 3.

The next king was Ea-mukin-zer (about 1057 B. C.), who reigned but five months according to the King List, or three months according to the Chronicle. Of his reign, also, we have no further knowledge.¹

The last king was Kasshu-nadin-akhe, son of Sippai, who reigned but three years (about 1056–1054 B. C.) (Chronicle, six years), whose works are likewise unknown to us.

All of these kings, according to the statement of a later monarch, had labored upon the rebuilding of the Temple of the Sun at Sippar.

Immediately after this dynasty there follows another of three kings, called the dynasty of the house of Bazi, of which we know only the names of the rulers and the somewhat doubtful number of years which they reigned. These kings are:

Eulbar-shakin-shum, seventeen years (Chronicle, fifteen) (about 1053–1037 B. C.).

Ninib-kudur-usur, three years (Chronicle, two) (1036–1034 B. C.).

Silanim-shukamuna, three months (about 1033 B. C.).

After this dynasty comes another with only one king, whose name is unknown. He is called an Elamite, reigned six years, and was buried in the palace of Sargon (about 1032–1027 B. C.). In his seizing of the throne we are reminded of the former Elamite movements under Eri-Aku.

¹ Inscription of Nabu-apal-iddin, col. i. See translation by Peiser, *Keilschrift. Bibl.*, iii, part i, p. 177.

With these three dynasties we have passed over a period of history in Babylonia of perhaps forty-six years. Our lack of knowledge of the period is of course partly due to absence of original documents, but it is also probably due to the fact that there was little to tell. We have lighted upon degenerate days. The real Babylonian stock had exhausted its vigor, and was now intermixed with Kassite and other foreign blood—a mixture which would later prove stronger than the pure blood which had preceded it, for mixed races have generally been superior to those of pure blood. But there was hardly time yet for a display of its real force. Besides this Babylonia had suffered from invasions from Assyria, from Elam, and from the Sea Lands, at the head of the Persian Gulf. It was not surprising that a period not only of peace but of stagnation had come.

The most noteworthy fact in these forty-six years is the arising from the far south of the so-called dynasty of the Sea Lands. The names of these three kings are chiefly Kassite, and that would seem to imply that the Kassites had also overrun this land as well as the more central parts of Babylonia. However that may be, this is the country which is also called the land of the Kaldi, or, in the later form, the land of Chaldea. This is the period of the growth and development of new states on all sides, as we shall see in the survey to follow, and it is the first appearance of the Chaldeans in Babylonian history. Their sub-

sequent history shows that they were Semites, though perhaps, as above stated, of somewhat mixed blood. It is not known when they first entered the land by the sea, from which they had now invaded Babylonia. It has been suggested that their power in Babylonia was attained not by conquest, but by a slow progress of emigration.¹ The view is plausible, perhaps even probable, for they seem to have become kings in a period of profound peace, but there is no sure evidence.

In following the line of Babylonian kings we have now reached another period of extreme difficulty. The native Babylonian King Lists are so badly broken that no names are legible for a long period, and but very few of the numerals which give their years of reign. It is possible, however, from the fragmentary notices of Assyrian kings, from the Synchronistic History, and from certain business documents to recover a few of the names, which will be set down in their approximate order as the story progresses. The next of the kings of Babylonia seems to have been Nabu-ukin-abli,²

¹ Winekler, *Geschichte*, p. 113.

² The whole question of this king's personality and date is exceedingly obscure. If he is the first king of the eighth dynasty, he must have reigned for thirty-six years, for that numeral appears clearly in Knudtzon's copy in place of the thirteen years previously given. (Comp. Knudtzon, *Assyrische Gebete an den Sonnengott*, i, 60, with Schrader in *Sitzungsberichte der Berl. Ak. der Wiss.*, 1887, pp. 579-607, 947-951.) Of his name there is no doubt, for he is mentioned on the curious boundary stone of Niuib-kudurusur (British Museum, No. 102), published by Belser, *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, ii, 171, ff. As Peiser has correctly pointed out in his translation (*Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, iv, 82, ff.), the stone has on it writing of different dates, and this, of course, adds to the difficulty. Peiser's

who reigned apparently thirty-six years (about 1026–991 B. C.), and whose portrait, accompanied by his titles as king of Kishshati and king of Babylonia, is given on a curious boundary stone. This is all that is known of him or his reign.

While we have been laboriously threading our way through the weary mazes of this obscure succession of dynasties in Babylonia we have left aside a period of silence in Assyria after the reign of Tiglathpileser I and his two sons. We have now seen that during this period there was no display of power and energy in Babylonia, but the people of Chaldea, using perhaps this very opportunity, had been able to establish themselves well in their own land, and even to attain power in Babylonia.

In the west there were movements of still greater importance among the Semitic peoples. Just as the decay of Babylonian power gave opportunity to the Chaldeans, so the decay of Assyrian power and the consequent absence of its threats against the west gave great opportunity to the peoples of Syria and Palestine. As the Assyrian power must soon meet these new foes, as well as old foes in new locations, we must survey this field of the west before we proceed further with the story of Assyria.

Several times before in this history we have

difficulty about the number of years of reign assigned to Nabu-ukin-abli is removed if the incorrect 13 of the older publications of the King List be corrected into 36, in accordance with Knudtzon's excellent copy.

met with a people known as the Aramæans. Like the Assyrians and Babylonians, they were a Semitic people whose original homeland was Arabia, and probably northern Arabia. Whether Aramæans began to leave Arabia before or after the Babylonians will probably never be known with certainty. As the Mesopotamian valley was so much more desirable a place of dwelling than the lands later occupied by the Aramæans, it seems reasonable to suppose that this valley was already occupied by the Babylonians when the Aramæans came out of Arabia and moved northward. They left settlements along the edges of the Babylonian kingdom, some of which were readily absorbed, while others remained to vex their stronger neighbors for centuries. In their migrations toward the north they seemed to follow very nearly the course of the Euphrates, though bodies of them crossed over toward the Tigris and became, as we have seen, thorny neighbors of the Assyrians during the founding of the Assyrian kingdom. At the period which we have now reached their strongest settlements were along the northern Euphrates, in the neighborhood of the river Sajur. Pitru (the biblical Pethor¹) and Mutkinu, which had been filled with Assyrian colonists by Tiglathpileser, were now in the hands of the Aramæans. It is altogether probable, also, that they had silently possessed themselves of territory farther north along the Euphrates, perhaps even as far as Amid, which

¹ Num. xxii, 5; Deut. xxiii, 4.

Tiglathpileser had conquered, but which had to be reconquered, and from the Aramaeans, in a short time. But the greatest achievement of the Aramaeans was not in the upper Mesopotannian valley. They were in force in this valley when the Hittite empire fell to pieces, and to them came the best of what it possessed. Carchemish, at the fords of the Euphrates, had been passed by, and moving westward, they had seized Aleppo and Hamath and then, most glorious and powerful of all, Damascus fell into their hands. Here they founded their greatest kingdom, and centuries must elapse before the Assyrians would be able to break down this formidable barrier to their western progress. But these facts have another significance besides the political. The Aramaeans were essentially traders. The territory which they now possessed was the key to the trade between the east and the west. The products of Assyria and of Babylonia could not cross into Syria and thence in ships over the Mediterranean westward without passing through this Aramaean territory, and so paying tribute. The Aramaeans had become the land traders, as the Phoenicians were the sea traders. Now, the Assyrians were also a commercial people, shrewd, eager, and persevering. It could not be long before the king of Assyria would be pressed by the commercial life of Nineveh to undertake wars for the winning back from the Aramaeans of this territory so valuable in itself, and so important for the development of Assyrian commerce. However the

Assyrians, who were never a maritime people, might endure the submission of their commercial ambition to the Phœnicians on the sea, it was not likely that they would yield up the highways of the land to a people less numerous and less strong than themselves. In the period of decay that followed the reign of Tiglathpileser this new power had risen up to bar their progress. We shall see shortly how the difficulty was met.

During the same period another power, not so great, and yet destined to influence strongly the later history of Assyria and soon to excite Assyrian cupidity, had been slowly developing in the land of Palestine south of the Aramaean strongholds. When the Hebrews crossed over the Jordan into Palestine they found a number of disorganized tribes lately freed from Egyptian rule and not yet organized into a confederation sufficiently strong to resist the fresh blood which came on them suddenly from out the desert.¹ The Hebrews in their desert sojourn had worn off the feeling of a subject population, and from the desert air had taken in at every breath the freedom which to this very day inspires the desert Arab. It was a resistless force which Joshua led in the desultory campaigns beyond the Jordan. The period of the Judges was a rude and barbaric age, but it was an age in which Israel developed some idea of national life and some power of

¹ See a fresh and vigorous statement of the Canaanite situation in Guthe, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, § 11, pp. 33-38.

self-government. If the conquests of Tiglath-pileser had continued many years longer, he would surely have been led to invade Palestine, and the Hebrews, without a fixed central government, without a kingly leader, without a standing army, would have fallen an easy prey to his disciplined and victorious troops. But the period of Assyrian weakness which followed his reign gave the needed breathing spell in the west, and the kingdom of Saul and David was established. Herein was established a new center of influence ready to oppose the ambition of Assyrian kings and the commercial cupidity of Assyrian traders.

The political aspect of western Asia had changed considerably in the period 1050–950 B. C. During this century we do not know anything of the life of the Assyrian people. The names of the kings Asshurnazirpal II (about 1050 B. C.), Erba-Adad, and Asshur-nadin-akhe belong in this period, and the last two erected buildings in the city of Asshur, the restoration of which became a care to a later king¹ after a lapse of one hundred and fifty years. After these kings there ruled a certain Asshur-erbi, though whether he was their immediate successor or not does not appear. He has left us no accounts of his wars or of his labors. From the allusions of two later Assyrian kings we learn that it was in his reign that the

¹ Asshurnazirpal III in his hunting inscription (col. ii, lines 4, ff.) alludes to Erba-Adad and Asshur-nakin-akhe. See the translations by Peiser in *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, i, p. 127.

Aramæans seized Pitru (Pethor) and Mutkinu,¹ so that his reign is another evidence of the period of weakness and decay in Assyria. But he seems, on the other hand, to have invaded the far west, for on the Phœnician coast he carved his portrait in relief upon the rocks,² probably in the rocky gorge of the Nahr-el-Kelb, north of Beirut, a place much used for the same purpose by later Assyrian conquerors.

At about 950 B. C. Tiglathpileser II began to reign in Assyria, and from his time on to the end of the Assyrian empire we possess an unbroken list of the names of the kings. He is called king of Kishshati and king of Asshur,³ and with his name and his titles our knowledge begins and ends. He was succeeded by his son, Asshur-dan II⁴ (about 930 B. C.), and he again by his son, Adad-nirari II (911–891 B. C.), in whose reign the old struggles between Assyria and Babylonia began again. Babylonia was now ruled by Shamash-mudammik, and these two monarchs met in battle at the foot of Mount Yalman and the Babylonian was utterly overthrown. We hear no more of him, and his life may have ended in the battle.

¹ Shalmaneser, *Monolith*, ii, 37. On this text comp. especially Winckler, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 22, 23, footnote 6, and *Geschichte*, p. 332, note 38 (to page 181).

² Shalmaneser, Balawat, ii, 3. Comp. also Winckler, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 22, 23 footnote 6.

³ No inscription of Tiglathpileser II has been preserved, and we owe these facts to the inscription of Adad-nirari II (*Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, ii, p. 311; *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, i, pp. 48, 49).

⁴ See the same inscription of Adad-nirari II.

The struggle was renewed by his successor, Nabu-shum-ishkun, who likewise suffered defeat at the hands of Adad-nirari II, and was compelled to yield some cities to the Assyrians, after which a treaty of peace was made between the two nations. Besides these notices of the relations between the two kingdoms our only record of the times is a short inscription of Adad-nirari II,¹ in which his genealogy only is given. His son, Tukulti-Ninib II (890–885 B. C.), introduces us to the threshold of a new period of Assyrian conquest. He began again the campaigns in the north, which had rested since the days of Tiglath-pileser I, over whose course, in part, he marched, piercing the highlands even to the confines of Urartu (Armenia) and extending his ravages from Lake Urumiyeh on the east to the land of Kummukh on the west. At Supnat (Sebeneh-Su) he caused his relief portrait to be set up alongside of that of Tiglathpileseser, whose exploits he had been emulating.

In his reign Assyria gives plain indication that the period of decay and of weakness was past. The Babylonians had been partially humbled, and were at least not threatening. The Assyrians were therefore free to begin again to assert the right to tribute in the north and northwest. In the next reign the issue is joined, and a new period of Assyrian progress begins.

¹ Published by Winckler, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, ii, p. 311, and translated by him in *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, i, pp. 48, 49.

CHAPTER IV.

THE REIGN OF ASSHURNAZIRPAL.

WHEN Asshurnazirpal (885–860 B. C.) succeeded his father on the throne of Assyria he inherited opportunities rather than actual possessions. The kingdom over which he ruled from his capital city of Nineveh was comparatively small. Babylonia, while not physically so strong as Assyria, was, nevertheless, entirely independent under the reign of Nabu-apal-iddin (about 880 B. C.), who probably began to reign very shortly after Asshurnazirpal. The countries to the north which had been conquered by Tiglathpileser I and again overrun by Tukulti-Ninib were only tributary, and not really governed from Nineveh. Furthermore their tribute was not paid voluntarily, but only when an Assyrian army stood ready to collect it by force. The Aramaeans possessed the best lands in the upper Mesopotamian valley, and must be met on the field of battle. The opportunity was great, because none of these peoples were strong enough to oppose Assyria single-handed, and there was no present prospect of any sort of union between them. Asshurnazirpal was in every respect the man for this situation; no king like him had arisen before in Assyria.

Abundant historical material enables us to follow closely the development of his plans and the course and conduct of his campaigns. His standard inscription upon alabaster¹ contains three hundred and eighty-nine lines of writing, and gives, in almost epic grandeur, the story of the truly imperial plans which he had made for Assyria. This longest and best known text is supplemented by no less than eight other texts,² some shorter originally, some fragmentary. Some of these are repetitions, either in the same or varying phrase, and thus add to the certainty of the text which may be made from their comparison.

In the very first year of the king's reign his campaigns of conquest begin, and it is in the north that he must first tranquilize populations by destruction and savage butchery. The course of his march was first northwestward, apparently following closely the course of the Tigris for a short distance and then striking due north over "impassable roads and trackless mountains" to the

¹This fine monolith, discovered by Layard at Nimroud, was first published by him (*Inscriptions in the Cuneiform Character*, plates 1-11) in a very fragmentary manner. It is republished I R. 17-26. The first English translation by Rodwell (*Records of the Past*, First Series, pp. 37-80) is well supplanted by the new translation by Sayee, with numerous valuable geographical and historical notes (*Records of the Past*, New Series, ii, pp. 128-177). There is a very valuable translation of col. i, lines 1-99, with notes, by Lhotzky (*Die Annalen Assurnazirpal's*, München, 1884), but this was unfortunately never carried further. The entire text is translated by Peiser, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, i, pp. 50-119.

²The most important of the lesser inscriptions are the following: (a) III R. 4, No. 8, translated by Peiser, *op. cit.*, i, pp. 122, 123; (b) I R. 28. A hunting inscription to which belongs also III R. 4, No. 1 (comp. Delitzsch, *Die Kossäer*, p. 10), translated by Peiser, *op. cit.*, i, pp. 122-129.

land of Nimme, which we are to locate west of Lake Van, about the neighborhood of Mush.¹ Here were found strong cities, meaning thereby cities fortified against invasion, which were soon captured, with the loss of many fighting men to the enemy. According to the Assyrian account the remainder of the defenders fled into the mountains, there to hide like birds until, after a three days' march, Asshurnazirpal overtook them "nest-ed" amid the fastnesses and slew two hundred of them. Thence returning again into their country, he threw down the walls of their cities and dug them up, and set fire to the heaps of ruins. There was no reason to doubt that the survivors would pay tribute to Assyria, if indeed anything had been left them wherewith to pay after such a visitation. The memory of such discipline might be expected to abide, while the report of it was sure to spread rapidly, after the fashion of an oriental story, among surrounding tribes who might learn from it the wisdom of surrender and of tribute paying without an attempt at a defense of national or tribal liberty. So it fell out, for when Asshurnazirpal, leaving the waste behind him, went southwestward into the land of Kirruri,² by the

¹ So Sayee, *Records of the Past*, New Series, ii, p. 138, note 2. Maspero (*The Passing of the Empires*, p. 14, footnote 1) would loealize it still more closely in the "eazas of Varto and Boulanik in the sandjak of Mush." Its capital, Gubbe (Sayee reads Libê), he would provisionally identify with Gop (Vital Cuinet, *La Turquie d'Asie*, ii, pp. 588, 589).

² There is much dispute about the location of the Kirruri. The narrative of Asshurnazirpal's progress makes it plain that they were close to the Numme, or Nimme. Delattre (*Encore un mot sur la Geographie Ass.*, p. 10,

side of Mount Rowandiz, he found ready for his taking a great tribute of oxen, sheep, wine, and a bowl of copper, and an Assyrian governor was easily established over the land, to look rather after its tribute than its worthy governing. And while these events were happening the people of Gozan (between the Tigris and Lake Urumiyeh) and the people of Khubushkia,¹ who lived west of them and nearer the old limits of Assyria, also sent a voluntary tribute consisting of "horses, silver, gold, lead, copper, and a bowl of copper." From such bloodless successes the king turned southward into the land of Qurkhi of Betani (along the bank of the Tigris eastward of Diarbekir) and fought with a population who only fled to the mountains after a bitter defeat. They also were overtaken, and two hundred and sixty of their heads were built into a pyramid; their cities were wasted and burned, and an Assyrian governor was set to rule them. Bubu, the son of the chief of Nishtum, one of their cities, was flayed in the city of Arbela and his skin spread on the fortress wall.

So stands the sickening record of the first year's campaign.² This savage beginning augured ill for the new states which had sprung up since the days of Tiglathpileser. What mercy was there to

note 4) is therefore certainly wrong in locating them near the sources of the Tigris. See, further, Billerbeck, *Das Sandschak Sulcimania*, pp. 15, ff.

¹ Billerbeck, *op. cit.* pp. 20, f., and comp. Maspero, *op. cit.*, p. 15, footnote.

² Annals of Asshurnazirpal, i, 42-69, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, i, pp. 59, ff.; *Records of the Past*, New Series, ii, pp. 138, ff.

be found in a man of this quality? If years and vigor were his portion, it would be difficult to set a limit to his success as a conqueror, while the early placing of governors over communities which had surrendered seemed to imply that he had also gifts as an administrator. But we follow his story further. In the next year (884 B. C.) the king invaded Kummukh, perhaps to insure payment of the annual tribute, or there may have been signs of rebellion. There was more of conquering to do on the way, and then Kummukh was entered, apparently without a struggle. But before the king's purpose had developed, whatever it may have been, he was summoned to the banks of the Euphrates.

The Aramaean communities along the Euphrates had no central government. They lived under the old forms of city governments, some still independent, some dependencies of Assyria with Assyrian governors. Bit-Khalupe was one of these subject communities located on the Euphrates, about halfway between the Balikh and the Khabur (modern Halebe), and the governor was Khamitai, an Assyrian subject. There was a rebellion here—so ran the intelligence brought to the Assyrians—the Assyrian governor was slain, and his place had been given to a certain Akhi-yababa brought from Bit-Adini. It was summons enough. Asshurnazirpal showing thereby the mobility of his army, came southward along the course of the Khabur, halting at Sadikan (or

Gardikan, the modern Arban)¹ to receive tribute from an Aramaean prince, Shulman-khaman-ilani, and again at Shuma to receive like honor from Ilu-Adad, in silver, gold, lead, plates of copper, variegated cloths, and linen vestments. The news of his approach reached Bit-Khalupe, and the faint hearts of the people sank in them. They surrendered, saying as they came from the city gates and took hold of the conqueror's feet, in token of submission, "Thou willest and it is death, thou willest and it is life; the will of thy heart will we perform."² But even this abject surrender did not avail with such a man as Asshurnazirpal. He attacked the city and compelled the delivering up of all the soldiers who had joined in the rebellion. No mention is made of the treatment of the private soldiers, but their officers' legs were cut off. The nobles who had shared in the uprising were flayed, and their skins stretched over a pyramid erected, and apparently for this very purpose, at the chief gate of the city. Then the city, plundered of all its wealth and beauty,³ was left a monument of ferocity and a warning to conspirators. The unhappy Akhi-yababa was sent off to Nineveh, there to be flayed that his skin

¹ The location is certain. See Rawlinson, *Five Great Monarchs*, 2d ed., i, p. 205, and ii, p. 84, and Hommel, *Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens*, pp. 557, 558. Layard (*Nineveh and Babylon*, pp. 230-242) found the remains of a palace on the site, which had been decorated with bas-reliefs and guarded with lions and wingéd bulls.

² Asshurnazirpal I, 81.

³ The possession of so much wealth and of so many artistic objects is an instructive commentary upon the age and extent of this civilization.

might adorn the fortress walls, while his place as Assyrian governor over Bit-Khalupe was taken by Azilu. As in the former year, the story of this punishment went abroad. The rulers of Laqi¹ and Khindanu² hastened to send tribute to the conqueror while he was staying at Suri, while yet another Aramaean people, the Shuhites, sent Ilubani, their ruler, and his sons to carry a costly tribute direct to Nineveh.

Following these events there was a lull in the king's actions, while he stayed at Nineveh, as though there were no more lands to conquer. But news reached him of a revolt among Assyrian colonists planted by Shalmaneser I at Khalzi-lukha,³ under the leadership of one Khula. Again must the king march northward into lands always troubled. On this march the king erected at the sources of the river Supnat a great inscribed portrait of himself by the side of the reliefs of Tiglathpileser I and Tukulti-Ninib. Thence he moved northwestward to the slopes of Mount Masius, where Khula was captured, his men butchered, and his city razed. On the return march, in the country of Nirbi, the lowlands about the modern Diarbekir,⁴ he took and devastated the chief city, Tela,

¹ Their territory lay along the Euphrates and probably a little to the south of the Suru.

² Sayce (*Records of the Past*, New Series, ii, p. 144, note 2) doubtfully suggests that Khindanu may be "the Giddan of classical geography, on the eastern bank of the Euphrates."

³ Or Khalzi-dipkha. Maspero (*The Passing of the Empires*, p. 19, note 2) would locate it in the district of Severek.

⁴ So Sayce, *Records of the Past*, New Series, ii, p. 146, note 1.

which was defended by a threefold wall, slaying three thousand of its fighting men. A little farther south the king approached the city of Tus-kha,¹ in whose site he apparently recognized an important vantage point, for he halted to restore it. The old city wall was changed, and a new wall built in massive strength from foundation to the coping. Within these walls a royal palace was erected, an entirely new structure. A new relief of the king's person, fashioned of white limestone, and inscribed with an account of the king's wars and conquests in the land of Nairi, was set in the city walls, to be studied as a warning by its inhabitants. The city thus rebuilt and restored was peopled by Assyrian colonists and made a store-house for grain and fodder. The aim, apparently, was to use it as a base of supplies in military operations against the north and west. Some of the inhabitants of the land had fled, but upon payment of homage were allowed to return to their cities and homes, many of these in ruins. A heavy annual tribute was put upon them, and their sons were taken away to Nineveh as hostages.

While engaged in this work of reconstruction much tribute was received from neighboring states. Later in the year another district in the land of Nirbu, near Mount Masius, revolted, and was sub-

¹ Site uncertain. Rawlinson ("Assyrian Discovery," *The Athenaeum*, 1863, vol. i, p. 228) would locate it at Kurkh, near the Tigris, east of Diarbekir. At this place was found a monolith of Asshurnazirpal, and this proves that he was in some way identified with the place. There is, however, no real proof that it was Tuskhā.

dued in the usual manner. On the return journey to Nineveh the people of Qurkhi, the inhabitants about Malatiyeh, and the Hittites paid tribute to the apparently resistless conqueror. The next year (882) witnessed an uprising in the southeast led by Zab-Dadi, a prince of the country of Dagara, to whom the people of Zamua¹ also joined themselves. There was thus in revolt a considerable section of territory lying in the mountains east of the Tigris and between the Lower Zab and the Turnat (modern Shirwan) Rivers. Not satisfied with the attempt to escape annual tribute, these daring warriors thought to invade Assyrian soil. The battle with them, fought out in the lowlands, was an Assyrian victory, and the campaign ended in the receipt of a heavy tribute, and the taking of many cities, which, contrary to former custom, were not destroyed.² This new method was, however, soon abandoned, for the next year (881) these people refused to pay their tribute, and their country was again invaded. This time savagery had its sway, and the cities were dug up and burned, while blood was poured out like water. It was now safe to advance through the broken land farther into the mountains for more plunder, but we are not able to follow the king's movements in this extended campaign for lack of geographical knowledge.

¹ The location of the Zamua is easily determined. See Billerbeck, *Das Sandschak Suleimania*, pp. 18, 39, ff., etc.

² Asshurnazirpal, ii, 23-49. See translations by Sayce, *op. cit.*, pp. 149, ff., and by Peiser, *op. cit.*, pp. 74, ff.

It is especially noteworthy that, though the usual destructions prevailed, there were again displayed some constructive ideas, for the city of Atlila,¹ which had previously been destroyed by the Babylonians, was rebuilt and made an Assyrian fortress, with a king's palace, and with the Assyrian name of Dur-Asshur. This completed, for a time at least, the subjugation of the eastern borders of the kingdom, and the king could establish a regular collection of tribute in the north. The wealth poured into Calah year after year in these raids must have been enormous. Herein lies the explanation of the possibility of maintaining a standing army and carrying on conquests of outlying territory. The Assyrian people could not have stood the drain of resources necessary for foreign conquest, nor could the merchants of Nineveh have borne a system of taxation sufficient to maintain armies so constantly on the march. It is noteworthy that nearly every campaign made thus far in this brilliant reign was for tribute gathering. The king was not yet ready for the attempt to add largely to his empire, nor even to extend widely the area of his tribute getting. Time for the training of his army was necessary, and funds had to be accumulated for the payment and equipment of his troops. Undoubtedly many adventurers from among foreign conquered peoples

¹ The location is quite unknown. Maspero (*The Passing of the Empires*, p. 26, note 1) would identify it with the modern Kerkuk. Billerbeck (*Das Sandschak*, etc., p. 36) would place it farther to the southeast, "west of Segirme and Chalchal-an-dagh."

fought in the armies of Asshurnazirpal, and found their compensation in such booty as they were allowed to appropriate. It remains, however, true that the cost of the military establishment must have been great, and the collection of tribute supplied this outlay. The king watched closely the collection of tribute, and nonpayment anywhere was the signal for a sudden descent on the offenders. "During the eponymy of Bel-aku (881 B. C.) I was staying in Nineveh when news was brought that Ameka and Arastua had withheld the tribute and dues of Asshur my lord"¹—so began this campaign of which we have just spoken, and so began many another. Herein we have an instructive commentary on the whole policy of Assyria for years to come. Let us recall the need of conquering the Aramaeans to secure commercial extension, and the need of the tribute to maintain an army capable of such conquest, and in these two motives, the one depending upon the other, we have the explanation of Assyrian history for this reign, and for not less than six reigns after it.

In the next year (880 B. C.) the king collected in person the tribute of the land of Kummukh, afterward pushing on through the land of Qurkhi, into the fastnesses of Mount Masius, for a like purpose, and finally returning to the fortress of Tushkha to continue his former building operations. That so large a part of the year is occupied with the careful and systematic collection of

¹ Annals, col. ii, line 49, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, i, pp. 78, 79.

tribute foreshadows a great campaign of conquest toward which this storing up of supplies of money and material is a necessary preparation. Possibly the traders of Nineveh, profiting by the earlier punishment of the Aramaeans, were urging the king to wider conquests in the prosperous west, which would result in a still further extension of their trade. However that may be, the year 879 brought matters of immense importance in Assyrian history. The king first marched southwest to the Euphrates and the Khabur. The Aramaeans of Bit-Khalupe had not forgotten their sore discipline, and paid their tribute at once. And in like manner one community after another gave their silver and gold, their horses and cattle, to their suzerain as he moved slowly down the Euphrates to Anat (modern Anath).

All this resembles former campaigns, but now a sudden change appears. Attempting to collect tribute at Suru (another city of the same name as the capital of Bit-Khalupe), Asshurnazirpal finds the Shuhites, whose chief city Suru was, in league with the Kassite Babylonians in their resistance. The Babylonian king at this time was Nabu-apal-iddin, who began to reign in his ancient city probably very soon after Asshurnazirpal began to reign in Assyria. He was either a weak man or a man of extraordinary policy, or he would long before this have been in conflict with his northern neighbor. In the discontent of the Shuhites he saw a hopeful opportunity for injuring Assyria

without too great risk to his own fortunes. He contributed to the revolt not less than fifty horsemen and three thousand footmen—a considerable contribution in the warfare of that century. For two days the battle raged in and about Suru before the Assyrians obtained the mastery. Asshurnazirpal punished this uprising in his usual way, by utterly wasting the city, slaying many of its inhabitants, and carrying away immense spoil. He is probably narrating only the simple truth when he says that the fear of his sovereignty prevailed as far as Kardunyash and overwhelmed the land of Kaldu. The Babylonian king, though he continued to reign for some time after this, gave no further trouble to Assyria. He was kept busily engaged in his own land in two important enterprises. The Aramaean tribe known as the Sutu, whom we have met in this story in northern Babylonia, had centuries before wrought ruin at the ancient religious city of Sippar, where the worship of the sun god had its especial seat. With the destruction of the temples the worship carried on for so many centuries ended. The former kings belonging to the dynasty of the Sea Lands, Shamash-shipak and Kasshu-nadin-akhe, had tried in vain to prevent the total destruction of the temple and to reorganize its worship. Their efforts had completely failed, and the temple had now become a hopeless ruin, covered with sand of the near-by desert. Here was a work for the pious king. Dislodging the Sutu from the city by force of

arms, Nabu-apal-iddin began the reconstruction and restoration of the fallen temple, and carried the work to a successful conclusion, setting up again the splendid old ceremonial worship of the sun. The inscription in which he has celebrated these deeds is one of the most beautiful monuments of ancient Babylonia.¹ To carry them out fully he seems to have maintained the peace with Asshurnazirpal and his successor.

But if the success and severity of Asshurnazirpal caused the king of Babylon to occupy himself entirely with internal affairs, it had little effect on the hardy and daring Aramaeans, for scarcely had the Assyrian king returned to Calah when he was again called into the field by the revolt of the men of Laqi and Khindanu and of the whole Shuhite people. This time the king was better prepared for the work in hand, for he had boats constructed at Suru, and was therefore able to follow the fugitives to the river islands. The ruin of this campaign seems awful even after the lapse of centuries. The cities were utterly broken down

¹ Rassam in making excavations at Abu Habba found a piece of asphalt pavement, beneath which "an inscribed earthenware casket, with a lid, was discovered . . . about three feet below the surface. Inside it was a stone tablet eleven and one half inches long by seven inches wide" (Rassam, *Asshur and the Land of Nimrod*, p. 402). It is inscribed minutely on both sides with three columns of writing, and on the obverse at the top is a small bas-relief representing religious ceremonies before the figure of the sun god (see illustrations in Rassam, *ibid.*, or in Hommel, *Geschichte*, p. 596). Pinches announced its discovery (*Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, iii, pp. 109, ff.), and later published part of it (*ibid.*, viii, pp. 164, ff.). The entire text is published V R. 60, 61, and it is translated by Joh. Jeremias, *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, i, 268, ff., and by Peiser, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, iii, part 1, pp. 174, ff.

and burned, the inhabitants butchered when they could be taken, and even the standing crops were destroyed that neither man nor beast might eat and live. It was no real compensation for such deeds that two new cities were founded, one on the hither bank of the Euphrates, named Kar-Asshurnazir-pal (that is, fortress of A.), and the other on the far bank, called Nibarti-Asshur¹ (that is, the ford of Asshur), for these could only be intended for military purposes, and not as a contribution to civilization or as abiding places for a ruined people. But the king was not satisfied that he had got at the root of the trouble, and the next year followed up his advantage with another campaign apparently intended to cut off any further rebellion at the fountain head. It seems probable that the real source of the energy and enthusiasm which sustained so many rebellions among the Aramaeans was the state of Bit-Adini, on the Euphrates, above the mouth of the Khabur.² The most powerful Ara-

¹ There is no indication of the location of either of these Assyrian strongholds. Maspero (*The Passing of the Empires*, p. 30, note 4) has this suggestion to make: "A study of the map shows that the Assyrians could not become masters of the country without occupying the passes of the Euphrates; I am inclined to think that Kar-Assur-nazir-pal is El-Halebiyeh, and Nibarti-assur, Zalebiyeh, the Zenobia of Roman times. For the ruins of these towns, compare Sachau, *Reise in Syrien und Mesop.*, pp. 256-259, and Peters, *Nippur, or Explorations and Adventures on the Euphrates*, vol. i, pp. 109-114."

² Maspero (*The Passing of the Empires*, p. 30, note 5) makes this definite statement: "Bit-Adini appears to have occupied, on the right bank of the Euphrates, a part of the cazas of Ain Tab, Rum-Kaleh, and Birejik, that of Suruji, minus the Nakhiyeh of Harrân, the larger part of the cazas of Membij and of Rakkah, and part of the caza of Zôr, the cazas being those represented on the maps of Vital Cuinet, *La Turquie d'Asie*, vol. ii."

mæan settlements were here, and the capital city, Kap-rabi¹ (great rock), was populous, well fortified, and defiant. If this city were taken, there would be hopes of crushing out completely the spirit of resistance.

In his next campaign (877 B. C.) Asshurnazirpal besieged the city and took it by assault, in which eight hundred of the enemy were killed and two thousand four hundred made prisoners. This was followed by its complete destruction, and an end was therefore made of incitements to rebellion in Bit-Adini. The effect on the remaining Aramaean settlements along the Euphrates was as marked as it was sudden. Others sent their unpaid tribute at once, and there was, during the reign of Asshurnazirpal, no further trouble over the prompt payment of the Aramaean tribute. With this campaign Asshurnazirpal had not indeed ended forever the fitful struggles of the Aramaeans against superior force. These were all renewed again in the very next reign. He had, however, settled the question that there could be no strong Aramaean state in that valley. The Aramaean people must go elsewhere to make their contribution to history and civilization.

The time had come, therefore, when all the lands north, east, and west as far as the Euphrates which had paid tribute to Tiglathpileser I were

¹ Asshurnazirpal (col. iii, line 51, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, i, p. 103) picturesquely describes Kap-rabi thus: "The city was very strong, like a cloud suspended from heaven."

again paying it regularly to Asshurnazirpal. There were no more of these states left to tranquilize. Most of them had been dealt with cruelly, many had been devastated, and thousands of their inhabitants butchered with all the accompaniments of oriental savagery. These communities had not been added regularly to the empire to be governed by satraps or officers making regular reports to the king in Assyria and receiving instructions from him. If such had been the plan, the peoples who paid tribute would have been receiving some sort of return in social order and royal direction for the heavy tribute paid. They were receiving nothing in return. They had to look to themselves for protection against the forays of barbarians who inhabited the mountain passes about them. Such a status was not likely to be permanent. While their punishment had been too severe for them to venture again to excite the wrath of such a monarch, they might nourish their wrath and hope for a better day. Perhaps the next Assyrian king might be a weak man, and they would be able to throw off the yoke in his day. Meantime, while Asshurnazirpal held the reins of government, it would be well to pay the tribute and give no excuse for a raid. But with this quiescence of the tributary states the employment of his army became a serious question with Asshurnazirpal. He had made a fighting machine such as had not been known before. His men had been trained in adversity,

toughened by hard marches, and brutalized by scenes of blood and fire. He could not disband it, for at once the tribute-paying states, unterrified by it, would throw off their dependence and the influx of gold would cease. He could not hold it in idleness, for such an aggregation of brutal passions would inflame the commonwealth and disturb the peace. The army would also soon lose its efficiency if unemployed, for the elaborate modern systems of drill for the conserving of health and the promotion of discipline were unknown. It is plain that these men must fight somewhere; but where should it be, and for what ulterior purpose? Ambition might answer to the king, for conquest and the extension of Assyrian territory, and greed might urge to further tribute getting, and commercial enterprise might clamor for the reopening of old lines of trade to the west through the territory of the Aramaeans. It was this last which prevailed, though the two former ideas had their influence and their share in the decision.

It was in the month of April¹ of the year 876 that Asshurnazirpal began the great westward movement in which all his highest endeavors were to culminate. All else had been but preparation. The first part of his march, across the great Mesopotamian valley, was little else than a triumphal progress. Every one of the Aramaean settlements on or near his route to the Euphrates sent costly

¹ On the eighth day of Iyyâr (col. iii, line 56).

tribute, consisting of chariots, horses, silver, gold, lead, and copper, most of which must be sent back to Calah, while the king marched on. When the Euphrates was reached it was crossed at its flood, in boats made of the skins of animals, and the city of Carchemish¹ was entered. The glory of the city had departed. Once the capital of the great Hittite empire, now broken in power, it was now merely the center of a small state, of which Sangara was ruler. His policy was direct and simple. He was willing to pay down the sum of twenty talents of silver, one hundred talents of copper, two hundred and fifty talents of iron, along with chains and beads of gold and much other treasure, if he were simply let alone. Though deprived of its political influence, Carchemish was now an important commercial city. War could only destroy its commerce, and success against the renowned Assyrian conqueror was doubtful, if not absolutely impossible. National pride counted for nothing. The primary desire was to get the Assyrians out of the country as soon as possible; and well might they pay a heavy tribute to gain so great a boon as that. Neighboring states, fearing invasion and plunder, likewise sent tribute, and the king could move on farther westward. Crossing the river Apre (modern Afrin) after a short march, Asshurnazirpal came into the territory

¹ Carchemish stood on the west bank of the Euphrates, above the mouth of the Sajur. The modern name is variously given by different travelers as Jerablūs (Skene, Wilson, Sayce) or Jerābīs (Sachau, Schrader, Delitzsch). The latter is preferable.

of another small state, called Patin, which was apparently Aramaean or partially so. The capital of the state was Kunulua, and the ruler was Lubarna, whose territory extended from the Apre to the Orontes, and thence over the mountain ridges to the sea near Eleutheros, with northern and southern limits not now definable.¹ It was a rich and fertile country, and might well excite the cupidity of the Assyrian army. Lubarna offered no resistance to the invader, but was anxious only to expedite his progress, with presents truly regal in amount and in magnificence.² The march was then southward across the Orontes to the city of Aribua,³ located near the Sangura River, which was a southerly outpost of Lubarna. Though Lubarna had so thoroughly submitted to the Assyrians in hope of getting them out of the country, Aribua was made an Assyrian outpost, colonists settled in it, and grain and straw, harvested by force in the lands of the Lukhuti, were stored in it. Whether the town was to become the capital of an Assyrian province or merely a base of supplies for possible hostile operations does not appear. And now there was no one to oppose the king's march north and west into the green slopes of the Lebanon.

¹ See Schrader, *Keilinschriften und Geschichtsforschung*, pp. 214-221, and Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, i, pp. 3, ff.

² "Twenty talents of silver, one talent of gold, one hundred talents of lead, one hundred talents of iron, one thousand oxen, ten thousand sheep, one thousand garments, variegated and linen . . . as his tribute I received." Asshurnazirpal, col. iii, 73-77 (*Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, i, pp. 106, 107).

³ The exact location of Aribua has not been found (Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, i, p. 5).

From beneath the historic cedars an Assyrian king again looked out over the Mediterranean, and with far greater hopes of securing a foothold there than any of his predecessors had ever had, whether Assyrian or Babylonian.

While this invasion was in some measure a raid for booty, it was more powerfully conceived and better disciplined than the others had been. When Sargon I had marched hither he passed through lands scantily populated with peoples, with whom he had little contact. There was no possibility of making an empire out of Babylonia and a province on the far western sea, with vast uncontrolled territories between. When Tiglathpileser I came out to the same sea he had left great territories and populous communities between him and the homeland, and, like the early Babylonian, there could be no hope of making an empire out of two lands so widely separated. But Asshurnazirpal had measurably changed the situation. He did not, it is true, actually rule the entire territory from the Lower Zab and its overhanging hills to the Lebanon, but he had broken its spirit, and was received as its conqueror. In many places rule was exercised by governors, both native and Assyrian, whom he had appointed. In yet others there were towns peopled by Assyrian colonists, stored with Assyrian provisions, and defended by massive walls of Assyrian construction. The situation was indeed changed, and the result of this invasion might well be different. Asshurnazirpal knew

the conditions with which he was confronted, and fully appreciated the opportunity for making a great empire. The Mediterranean was even then the basin upon which touched the greatest empire of the world; and the Egyptians understood the value of their geographical situation. The Phœnicians were already a powerful commercial people. The Hebrews formed an important center of influence in Canaan. What relation should Assyria come to sustain to these powers of antiquity? An augury of the answer to that question came as Asshurnazirpal halted on the Lebanon. The people of Tyre, of Sidon, of Tripolis,¹ and of Arvad sent splendid gifts, a fatal blunder, for it was a confession of weakness, which would be noted and remembered by the Assyrians. It was a recognition of the power of the Assyrian arms, of which almost every Assyrian king boasts in the stereotyped phrase: "By the might of the terrible arms;" and the Assyrians would bring forth yet greater daring as they remembered that the commercial rulers of the west feared their power too greatly to test it. And, worst of all, it was a confession to the world that these western peoples, who fronted the Mediterranean cared more for the profits of their commerce than for freedom. We shall see very shortly the results of this sending of gifts to the Assyrian king. Asshurnazirpal had achieved

¹ In Asshurnazirpal's account three cities are mentioned: Makhallat, Maiz, and Kaiz (Annals, col. iii, 86). Delitzsch (*Paradies*, p. 282) makes it probable that these three formed Tripolis, and Sayce apparently agrees (*Records of the Past*, New Series, ii, p. 172, note 1).

his present purpose in this direction. He did not go down to Tyre or Sidon to look upon the weaklings who paid tribute without seeing his arms, but turned northward into the Amanus mountains on an errand of peace. Here he cut cedar, cypress, and juniper trees and sent the logs off to Assyria. Somewhere else in the same district he cut other trees, called *mekhri* trees, which seem to have been numerous enough to give their name to the country in which they were found. These were taken back to Nineveh and offered to Ishtar, the lady of Nineveh.

So ended, in the peaceable gathering of building materials, a remarkable campaign. Asshurnazirpal had succeeded brilliantly where his predecessors had failed. But as we look back over the entire campaign we can discern significant silence concerning one western people. There is no allusion to Damascus or to any of its tributary states. They were all left undisturbed, and a glance at the map reveals how carefully the Assyrian army had avoided even their outposts. To have attacked that solidly intrenched state would have been certain disaster, and Asshurnazirpal was wisely instructed in passing it by. Years must elapse before the Assyrians should dare attack it.

The campaign was noteworthy also in that there had been almost no savagery, no butchering of men, scarcely any ruthless destruction of cities. This better state of war was of course due to no change of method on the part of Asshurnazirpal,

but simply to the almost entire absence of resistance. The former campaigns had terrified the world, and the fruits of severity were an easy conquest and the development of the peaceful art of building. The burning of cities and the slaughter of men were resumed in 867 in a small campaign through the lands of Kummukh, Qurkhi, and the oft-plundered country about Mount Masius. It was emphatically a campaign of tribute collecting, and the only matters of any political consequence were the appointment of an Assyrian governor over the land of Qurkhi and the carrying of about three thousand captives into Assyria. Such a leavening as that might influence the Assyrian people.

These renewed ravages ended the wars of Asshurnazirpal; the remainder of his reign was devoted to works of peace. But it would be a mistake to suppose that campaigning had occupied his entire attention during his reign, for undoubtedly the two chief works of his reign were executed partially during the very period when he was most busy with tribute collecting. These works were the rebuilding of the city of Calah and the construction of a canal. The former was necessary because the city which Shalmaneser I had built had been deserted during the period when Asshur was again the capital, and a short period of desertion always meant ruin to Assyrian buildings. Only the outer surface of its thick walls was built of burnt brick, the inner filling being composed of unburnt brick merely, so that

a trifling leak in the roof transformed this interior into a mass of clay, speedily causing the walls to spring. Judging from the hundreds of references in Assyrian literature to the restoration of walls and buildings, it may justly be thought that the Assyrians were especially bad roof builders. Indeed their advance in constructive skill never kept pace with their progress in the arts of decoration. It is this anomaly which has left us without any standing buildings in Assyria, while vast temples still remain in Egypt. It is, of course, to be observed that Assyrian construction would doubtless have shown a different development had stone been abundant as a building material. As an offset to this, however, it must be remembered that brick is one of the most durable of materials when properly baked and laid, and that the Assyrians knew how to bake properly is evidenced by their clay books, which have survived fire and breakage and wet during the crash and ruin of the centuries. Besides the general reconstruction of Calah, Asshurnazirpal built himself a great palace, covering a space one hundred and thirty-one yards in length and one hundred and nine in breadth,¹ which remained a royal residence for centuries. Its massive ruins have been unearthed at Nimroud, being the northwestern one of the three there discovered. His second great work was the construction, or reconstruction, of an aqueduct to

¹ Layard, *Nineveh and its Remains*, i, pp. 62, ff. See picture and plan in Rassam, *Asshur and the Land of Nimrod*, pp. 222, ff.

bring an abundant supply of water to the city from the Lower Zab. The river bank was pierced near the modern Negub, and the water first conveyed through a rock tunnel and then by an open canal to the great terrace. Its course was lined with palms, with various fruit trees, and with vineyards, and well was it named *Babelat-khigal* —the “ bringer of fruitfulness.”¹

In the year 860 B. C. the reign of Asshurnazirpal ended in peace. He had wrought great things for Assyrian power in the world, and the empire as he left it was greater actually and potentially than it had ever been before. Of the man himself the world can have no pleasant memories. No king like him in ferocity had arisen before him, and in Assyria at least he was followed by none altogether his equal. One searches the records of his reign and finds seldom anything more than catalogues of savage and relentless deeds. So rarely indeed does a work of mercy or peace brighten the record that it is a relief to turn the page.

¹ Monolith inscription, i, 5-9, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, i, pp. 118, 119. For the modern remains see Layard, *Nineveh and its Remains*, i, pp. 80, 81; *Nineveh and Babylon*, pp. 526-527.

109	131421	343	400 300 <hr/> 120000
<hr/> 327	343	327 3751 8990 <hr/> 12641	

CHAPTER V.

SHALMANESER II TO ASSHUR-NIRARI II.

SHALMANESER II (859–825 B. C.), who succeeded his father, Asshurnazirpal, continued his policy without a break, and even extended it. We are even better instructed concerning his reign, for more historical material has come down to us from it. The most important of his inscriptions is a beautiful obelisk of black basalt. The upper parts of the four faces contain beautifully carved figures of various animals which the king had received in tribute and as gifts, each illustration being accompanied by an epigraph explaining its meaning. The lower parts bear inscriptions recounting in chronological order the campaigns of the king. There are no less than one hundred and nine lines of compact writing upon this one monument.¹ This story of his wars is supplemented by the fine monolith of the king, containing his portrait in low relief, covered with one hundred and fifty-six lines of text.² And this again, in its turn, is supple-

¹ Black Obelisk, text published in Layard, *Inscriptions in the Cuneiform Characters*, 87–98. It has often been translated in whole or part. The best of the recent translations are by Winckler, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, i, pp. 128–151, and by Scheil, *Records of the Past*, New Series, iv, pp. 39, sqq., the latter with numerous corrections by Sayee.

² III R. 7, 8, translations by Craig, *Hebraica*, iii, 1887; Peiser, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, vol. i, pp. 150–175; and Scheil, *Records of the Past*, New Series, i v, pp. 55, sqq.

mented by fragmentary inscriptions upon bronze plates which once covered massive wooden doors or gates.¹ From these three main sources of information we are able to follow in order all the chief events of the king's reign. The accounts, however, are less picturesque and full of life than those of his predecessor. Campaigns are often dismissed in a few colorless words, and the record takes on the nature of a catalogue rather than of a history. We shall therefore present the story of his reign, not in its chronological but rather in its logical order, following the circle of his achievements from country to country. The annalistic style of Asshurnazirpal may stand as the representative of this reign, with the difference, already mentioned, that it possesses greater breadth and richer color.

For twenty-six years Shalmaneser led every campaign in person—an amazing record. His armies were then sent out under the leadership of the Tartan Asshur-dayan. Like his father, Shalmaneser was oppressed by the weight of his own army. It must fight or die, and when there was no excuse for operations of defense there must be a campaign to collect tribute, and when that was not needed fresh conquests must be attempted.

From his father he also inherited the old Ara-

¹ The gate inscriptions were secured in the mounds of Balawât by Hormuzd Rassam in 1877. They have been published and translated by Pinches in *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, vii, pp. 83, sqq., and by Amiaud et Scheil, *Inscriptions de Salmanasar I*, Paris, 1890, and also *Records of the Past*, New Series, iv, pp. 74, sqq.

mæan question, which was to consume much of his energy through a considerable part of his reign. We have seen that Asshurnazirpal broke the spirit of the Aramæans in the Mesopotamian valley and compelled them to pay tribute regularly. But, though this was true, it was to be expected that they would try his successor's mettle at the first opportunity. Of these states Bit-Adini was still the most powerful as well as the most daring. We are not told what act of Akhuni, ruler of Bit-Adini, led to an outbreak of hostilities, but we shall probably not be far wrong if we ascribe it to the ever-vexing tribute. Whatever the difficulty, Shalmaneser invaded the country in 859, the first year of his reign, and captured some of its cities, but apparently did not directly attack the capital. The invasion had to be repeated in 858 and again in 857, and in both years there were displays of savagery after the fashion of Asshurnazirpal. Pyramids of heads were piled up by city gates and the torch applied to ruined cities. But in the latter year the opposition to Assyrian domination was hopelessly broken down. The brave little land was annexed to Assyria, placed under Assyrian government, and colonists from Assyria were settled in it.¹

Such success was likely to lead soon to an attack upon the larger and richer Aramæan settlements farther west. The states with which he

¹ Obelisk, lines 26–32, 32–35, 35–45. Monolith i, 12–29; ii, 1–13, 13–30, 30–35.

would have to deal at first were Hamath, Damascus, and Patin, the small but fertile and powerful state between the Afrin and the Orontes, which had given much trouble to his father. Patin was not so powerful as the other two, but could not be left out of account in a western invasion. Hamath was the center of Aramaean influence in northern Syria, and under the leadership of Irkhulina was no mean antagonist. But by far the most powerful and important of the three states was Damascus, whose king at this time was Ben-Hadad II. If an enduring union could be formed between these two states and allies secured in Phoenicia and in Israel, the peoples of the west might defy even the disciplined and victorious armies of Assyria. But the ambition of Damascus to be actual head over all the western territory and mutual jealousies among the other states prevented any real union against the common oppressor. However, the threatened advance of Assyria was sufficient to bury for a time at least their differences and a confederation for mutual defense was formed for a year, during which time it was a powerful factor in the history of western Asia.

Shalmaneser II was ready for the attempt on the west in 854. The campaign of that year is of such great importance that it will be well to set it down in the words of the Monolith inscription, with such further comment as may be necessary to make its meaning clear :

“In the eponymy of Dayan-Asshur, in the month

of Airu, on the fourteenth day, from Nineveh I departed; I crossed the Tigris; to the cities of Giammu on the Balikh I approached. The fearfulness of my lordship (and) the splendor of my powerful arms they feared, and with their own arms they slew Giammu, their lord. Kitlala and Til-sha-apli-akhi I entered. My gods, I brought into his temples, I made a feast in his palaces. The treasury I opened, I saw his wealth; his goods and his possessions I carried away; to my city Asshur I brought (them). From Kitlala I departed; to Kar-Shulman-asharid I approached. In boats of sheepskin I crossed the Euphrates for the second time in its flood. The tribute of the kings of that side of the Euphrates, of Sangar of Carchemish, of Kundashpi of Kummukh, of Aramê, the son of Gusi; of Lalli, the Melidæan; of Khayani, son of Gabbar; of Kalparuda, the Patinian; of Kalparuda, the Gurgumæan; silver, gold, lead, copper (and) copper vessels, in the city of Asshur-utir-asbat, on that side of the Euphrates, which (is) on the river Sagur, which (city) the Hittites call Pitru, I received. From the Euphrates I departed, to Khalman I approached. They feared my battle (and) embraced my feet. Silver and gold I received as their tribute. Sacrifices I offered before Adad, the god of Khalman (modern Aleppo). From Khalman I departed; two cities of Irkhulina, the Hamathite, I approached. Adennu, Mashga, Argana, his royal city, I captured; his booty, goods, the possessions of his palaces I brought out (and)

set fire to his palaces. From Argana I departed, to Qarqar I approached; Qarqar, his royal city, I wasted, destroyed; burned with fire. One thousand two hundred chariots, 1,200 saddle horses, 20,000 men of Dadda-idri (that is, Ben-Hadad II) of Damascus; 700 chariots, 700 saddle horses, 10,000 men of Irkhulina, the Hamathite; 2,000 chariots, 10,000 men of Ahab, the Israelite; 500 men of the Quans;¹ 1,000 men of Musri; 10 chariots, 10,000 men of the Irkanatians; 200 men of Matinu-Baal, the Arvadite; 200 men of the Usanatians; 30 chariots, 10,000 of Adunu-Baal, the Shianian; 1,000 camels of Gindibu, the Arabian; . . . 1,000 men of Baasha, son of Rukhubi, the Ammonite—these twelve kings he took to his assistance; to make battle and war against me they came. With the exalted power which Asshur, the lord, gave me, with the powerful arms which Nergal, who goes before me, had granted me, I fought with them, from Qarqar to Gilzan I accomplished their defeat. Fourteen thousand of their warriors I slew with arms; like Adad, I rained a deluge upon them, I strewed hither and yon their bodies, I filled the face of the ruins with their widespread soldiers, with arms I made their blood flow. The destruction of the district . . .; to kill themselves a great mass fled to their graves

¹ Que is that part of Cilicia between the Amanus and the mountains of the Ketis (see Schrader, *Keilinschriften und Geschichtsforschung*, pp. 238-242). Winckler's conjecture (*Alttestament Untersuchungen*, pp. 168, ff.), which would place it in 1 Kings x, 28, is almost certainly correct. See further Benzinger and Kittel on the passage.

. . . without turning back I reached the Orontes. In the midst of this battle their chariots, saddle horses, (and) their yoke horses I took from them."¹

By means of this detailed and explicit account it is easy to follow the king's movements and understand the campaign. Shalmaneser leaves Nineveh and makes straight across the valley for the Balikh. He is here received with open arms, and secures great gifts. His next important stop is at Pethor, beyond the Euphrates, where more tribute, brought long distances, even from the land of Kum-mukh, is received. From Pethor to Aleppo the distance was short and the issue was the same—Aleppo surrendered without a blow. It is interesting to mark that Shalmaneser localizes in Aleppo the worship of the god Adad, to whom he paid worship. If this statement is correct, we may find in it a proof of early intercourse between Aleppo and Assyria, for we have long since found Adad worshiped in Assyria. This was the end of the unopposed royal progress. As soon as he crossed into the territory of the little kingdom of Hamath he was opposed. Three cities were, however, taken and left behind in ruins. Shalmaneser II then advanced to Qarqar,² a city located near the Orontes.

¹ Monolith inscription ii, lines 78–102. The parallel passage in the Obelisk inscription (lines 54–66) is brief and colorless. See Rogers, "Assyria's First Contact with Israel," *Methodist Review*, March-April, 1895, pp. 207–222.

² Its exact location is unknown. Maspero (*The Passing of the Empires*, p. 70, note 4) suggests that it "corresponds to the present Kalaat-el-Mudiq, the ancient Apamaea of Lebanon."

Here he was met by the allied army collected to defend the west against Assyria. Its composition throws light on the relative power of the states in Syria and Palestine and deserves attention. The main body of the army of defense was contributed by Hamath, Damascus, and Israel. These three states contributed much more than half of the entire army and nearly all of the most powerful part of it, the chariots and horsemen. From the north there came men from Que (eastern Cilicia) and Musri. From the west came detachments contributed by the northern Phoenician cities which were unwilling or unable to send enormous gifts to buy off the conqueror, as Tyre and Sidon had done, but were willing to strike a blow for independence. The last section was made up of Ammonites and Arabs. This was a formidable array, and the issue of the battle fought at Qarqar might well be doubted. The Assyrians had, of course, a well-seasoned army to oppose a crowd of raw levies; but the latter had the great advantage of a knowledge of the country as well as the enthusiasm of the fight for home and native land. Of course the records of Shalmaneser claim a great victory. In the Monolith inscription¹ the allies killed are set down at 14,000, in another inscription the number given is 20,500,² while in a third it rises to 25,000.³ The evident uncertainty in the figures makes

¹ Col. ii, lines 97 and 98.

² Obelisk, lines 65, 66.

³ Bull inscription, No. 1, line 18. On these discrepancies see Schrader, *Keilinschriften und Geschichtsforschung*, p. 47.

us doubt somewhat the clearness of the entire result. There is, as usual, no mention of Assyrian losses, but they must have been severe. The claim of a great victory is almost certainly false. A victory for the Assyrians it probably was, for the allies were plainly defeated and their union for defense broken up; but, on the other hand, the Assyrians did not attempt to follow up the victory they claimed, and no word is spoken of tribute or plunder or of any extension of Assyrian territory.¹ The alliance had saved the fair land of Hamath for a time and had postponed the day when Israel should be conquered and carried into captivity. It is a sore pity that despite the dread of the Assyrians, voiced so frequently by the Hebrews, and evidently felt by the other allies, mutual jealousy should have prevented the continuance of an alliance which promised to save the shores of the Mediterranean for Hebrew and Aramaean civilization.

Shalmaneser was busied elsewhere, as we shall shortly see, during the years immediately following, and it was not until 849 that he was able to make another assault on the west. The point of attack was again the land of Hamath, and again Ben-Hadad II of Damascus and Irkhulina of Hamath had the leadership over the twelve allies. This time Shalmaneser claims to have slain ten thousand of his enemies, but he mentions no tribute and no new territory. We may therefore be

¹The abrupt ending of the Monolith narrative is significant.

almost certain that the victory was rather a defeat, and that he was really compelled to withdraw. In 846 Shalmaneser once more determined to attack the foe which had done such wonderful work in opposing the hitherto invincible Assyrian arms. In this campaign he did not trust merely to his usual standing army, but levied contingents from the land of Assyria and with an enormous force, said by him to number 120,000 men, he set out for Hamath. Again he was opposed by Ben-Hadad II and his allies, and again he "accomplished their defeat." But, as in the previous campaigns and for the same reasons, we are compelled to assert that the Aramaeans had given full proof of their prowess by resisting the immense Assyrian army. The next attempt upon the west was made in 842. In this year Shalmaneser found a very different situation. Ben-Hadad II, who had ruled with a rod of iron and held the neighboring peoples in terror, was now dead,¹ and the cruel but weak Hazael reigned in Damascus. Ahab, who was a man of real courage and of great resources, was dead, as was Joram (852-842), his successor; and Jehu, the usurper, was now king in Samaria. He seems to have been a natural coward and did not dare to fight the terrible Assyrians. The other states which had united in defense under Ben-Hadad II were hopelessly discordant, each hoping to throw off the quasi-suzerainty of Damascus. The people of Tyre and Sidon had again

¹ 2 Kings viii, 7-15.

returned to their commerce and were ready to send gifts to Shalmaneser that they might not be disturbed at the gates of the seas. Jehu sent costly tribute, apparently in the mad hope of gaining Assyrian aid against the people of Damascus, whom he hated and feared, not reckoning that the Assyrians would seek this tribute year after year until the land should be wasted. This act of Jehu gave the Assyrians their first hold on Israel, and the consequences were far reaching and disastrous. Hazael, noble in comparison with all the former allies of Damascus, determined to resist Shalmaneser alone. In Saniru, or Hermon,¹ he fortified himself and awaited the Assyrian onslaught. Six thousand of his soldiers were killed in battle, while one thousand one hundred and twenty-one of his chariots and four hundred and seventy horses with his camp equipage were taken. Hazael fled to Damascus and was pursued and besieged by the Assyrians. But, powerful though he was, Shalmaneser was not able to take Damascus, and had to content himself with a thoroughly characteristic conclusion of the campaign. He cut down the trees about the city, and then marching southward, entered the Hauran, where he wasted and burned the cities.² So ended another assault on the much-coveted west, and it was still not con-

¹ Deut. iii, 9, comp. Driver on the passage, and Sayee, *Records of the Past*, New Series, vi, p. 41.

² Obelisk, lines 97-99 and Fragmentary Text, III R. 5, No. 6, 40-65. See translations by Rogers, *op. cit.* pp. 220, 221.

quered. No such series of rebuffs had ever been received by Tiglathpileser or by Asshurnazirpal, but Shalmaneser was not deterred from another and last attempt. In 839 he crossed the Euphrates for the twenty-first time and marched against the cities of Hazael. He claims to have captured four of them, but there is no mention of booty, and no word of any impression upon Damascus.¹

Shalmaneser had led six campaigns against the west with no result beyond a certain amount of plunder. There was absolutely no recognition of the supremacy of Assyria. There was no glory for the Assyrian arms. There was no greater freedom achieved for Assyrian commerce. And yet some progress had been made toward the great Assyrian ambition. The western states had felt in some measure the strength of Assyria, those certainly who sent gifts rather than fight had shown their dread; while the smoking ruins in the Hauran were a silent object lesson of what might soon happen to the other western powers which had hitherto resisted so gallantly. The Assyrian was beating against the bars set up against his progress, and the outcome was hardly, if at all, doubtful.

Besides his difficulties in the west Shalmaneser had no lack of trouble with the far north. As Damascus had a certain preponderance among the western states, so had Urartu (or Chaldia) among the northern states. There is some reason for be-

¹ Obelisk, lines 102-104.

lieving that at this time, as was true later on, Urartu may have tried to exercise some sort of sovereignty over the land of Nairi. This much, at least, is certain, that the people of Urartu were the mainspring of much of the rebellion among the smaller states in the north and west.

The long series of Assyrian assaults on Urartu had begun in the reign of Tiglathpileser I, who had crossed over the Arsanias and entered the country. Asshurnazirpal, also, had marched through the southern portion of the district, but had made no attempt to annex it to Assyria. In the very beginning of his reign, 860 B. C.,¹ Shalmaneser made the first move which led to this series of campaigns. He entered the land of Nairi and took the capital city of Khubushkia, on Lake Urumiyeh, together with one hundred other towns which belonged to the same country. These were all destroyed by fire. The king of Nairi was then pursued into the mountains and the land of Urartu (Chaldia) invaded. At this time Urartu was ruled by Aramê, who seems to have been a man of courage and adroitness. His stronghold of Sugunia was taken and plundered. Shalmaneser did not push on into the country, but withdrew southward by way of Lake Van, contented with his booty or too prudent to risk more. He made no more attempts on Urartu until 857,²

¹ The date is certain. It is correctly given as 860 by Tiele, *Geschichte*, i, p. 187, but erroneously as 858 by Scheil, *Records of the Past*, New Series, iv, p. 56, note 3.

² Incorrectly given as 856 by Scheil, *ibid.*, vol. iv, p. 63, note 1.

when his campaigning carried him westward and northward to Pethor and thence through Anzitene, which was completely laid waste, and over the Arsanias into Urartu. On this expedition the country of Dayaëni, along the river Arsanias, was first conquered and apparently without much opposition. The way was now open to the capital city, Arzashku. Aramê, the king of Urartu, fled further inland and abandoned his capital to the Assyrians, who wasted it as of old, and left it a heap of ruins while they pursued the fleeing king. He was overtaken, and thirty-four hundred of his troops killed, though Aramê himself made good his escape. Laden with heavy spoil, Shalmaneser returned southward, and, in his own picturesque phrase, trampled on the country like a wild bull. Pyramids of heads were piled up at the ruined city gates and men were impaled on stakes. On the mountains an inscription, with a great image of the conqueror, was set up. The defeat of Aramê seems to have brought his dynasty to an end, for immediately afterward we find Sarduris I, son of Lutipris, building a citadel at Van and founding a new kingdom. Shalmaneser returned to Assyria by way of Arbela. He had therefore completed a half circle in the north, passing from west to east, but had accomplished little more than the collection of tribute.¹

In the tenth year of his reign (850 B. C.) Shalmaneser II again invaded Urartu, this time enter-

¹ Obelisk, lines 35–45; Monolith, ii, 30–66.

ing the country from the city of Carchemish. The only achievement of the expedition was the taking of the fortified city of Arne and the ravaging of the surrounding country;¹ no enduring results were effected. More might, perhaps, have been attempted, but the king was forced to go into the west to meet the people of Damascus, as narrated above. Shalmaneser never again invaded Urartu in person. In the year 833 he sent an army against it under the leadership of his Tartan Dayan-Asshur. In the seventeen years which had elapsed since the last expedition the people of Urartu had been busy. The kingdom of Siduri (Sarduris I) had waxed strong enough to conquer the territories of Sukhme and Dayaëni, which for a time had seemed to belong to Assyria after having been so thoroughly conquered by Shalmaneser II. The account of the campaign ends in the vain boast of having filled the plain with the bodies of his warriors.² The sequel, however, shows that this campaign and another similar one in 829, under the same leadership, had not really conquered the land of Urartu.³ Instead of growing weaker it continued to grow stronger, and we shall often meet with displays of its power in the later Assyrian history. When the series of campaigns against the north was finally ended for this reign it could only be said that in the north and

¹ Obelisk, lines 85-87.

² Obelisk, lines 141-146.

³ Obelisk, lines 174-190.

in the west the Assyrian arms had made little real progress.

In the east also Shalmaneser failed to extend the boundaries of his kingdom. His efforts in this quarter began in 859, when he made a short expedition into the land of Namri,¹ which lay on the southwestern border of Media below the Lower Zab River. Not until 844 was the land again disturbed by invasion. At this time it was under the rule of a prince, Marduk-shum-udammiq, whose name points to Babylonian origin. He was driven from the country, and a prince from the country district of Bit-Khamban, by name Yanzu,² was put in his place.³ This move was not very successful, for the new prince rebelled eight years later and refused the annual tribute. In 836 Shalmaneser crossed the Lower Zab and again invaded Namri. Yanzu fled for his life to the mountains, and his country was laid waste. Shalmaneser, emboldened by this small success, then marched farther north into the territory of Parsua, where he received tribute, and then, turning eastward, entered the land of Media, where several cities were plundered and laid waste. There seems to have been no attempt made to set up anything like Assyrian rule over any portion of Media, but only to secure tribute. On the return by way of the south, near

¹ Obelisk, line 9.

² Yanzu is used in the Assyrian texts as a proper name, but Delitzsch (*Die Sprache der Kossäer*, pp. 25, 29-38) has shown that it is the title of kings in the Kossæan dialects.

³ Obelisk, lines 93-97.

the modern Holwan, Yanzu was taken prisoner and carried to Assyria.¹ But the efforts of Shalmaneser to control in the east, and especially the northeast, did not end here. The mountains to the northeast of Assyria had been a thorn in the side of many an Assyrian king. We have already seen how Shalmaneser at the very beginning of his reign ravaged and plundered in Khubushkia, on Lake Urumiyeh, farther north than the land of Namri. In 830 the king himself remained in Calah, sending an expedition to receive the tribute from the land of Khubushkia. It was promptly paid, and Dayan-Asshur, who was in command, led his troops northward into the land of Man,² which was wasted and burned in the usual fashion. Returning then by the southern shore of Lake Urumiyeh, several smaller states were plundered, and finally tribute was collected again in Parsua.³ In the next year (829) another campaign was directed against Khubushkia to enforce the collection of tribute, and thence the army marched northward through Musasir and Urartu, passing around the northern end of Lake Urumiyeh. Returning southward, Parsua was again harried and the unfortunate land of Namri invaded. The inhabitants fled to the mountains, leaving all be-

¹ Obelisk, lines 110–126.

² It is called Minni in Jer. li, 27. See especially Sayee, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, New Series, xiv, pp. 388–400, and Belck, “Das Reich der Mannaeer,” in the *Verhandlungen der Berl. anthropolog. Gesellschaft*, 1896, p. 480.

³ Obelisk, lines 159–174.

hind them. In a manner entirely worthy of his royal master the Tartan laid waste and burned two hundred and fifty villages before he came back by way of Holwan into Assyrian territory.¹ It is not too much to say that all these operations in the northeast, east, and southeast were unsuccessful. Shalmaneser had not carried the boundaries of his country beyond those left by Asshurnazirpal in these directions.

In the south alone did Shalmaneser achieve real success. The conditions which prevailed there were exactly fitted to give the Assyrians an opportunity to interfere, and Shalmaneser was quick to seize it. In the earlier part of his reign the Babylonian king was Nabu-aplu-iddin, who after his quarrel with Asshurnazirpal had devoted himself chiefly to the internal affairs of his kingdom. He made a treaty of peace with Shalmaneser,² and all went well between the two kingdoms until Nabu-aplu-iddin died. His successor was his son, Marduk-nadin-shum, against whom his brother, Marduk-bel-usate, revolted. This rebellion was localized in the southern part of the kingdom, comprising the powerful land of Kaldi. The Babylonians had engaged in no war for a long time, and were entirely unable to cope with the hardy warriors of Kaldi, whom Marduk-bel-usati had at his command. The lawful king, Marduk-nadin-shum, fearing that Babylon would be overwhelmed by the army which his brother

¹ Obelisk, lines 174-190.

² Synchronistic History, col. iii, 22-25.

was bringing against it, resolved upon the suicidal course of inviting Assyrian intervention. This was in 852, and no appeal could have been more welcome. Ever since the last period of Assyrian decay the kingdom of Babylonia had been entirely free of all subjection to Assyria. Here was an opportunity for reasserting the old protectorate. Shalmaneser marched into Babylonia in 852, and again in 851, and halted first at Kutha, where he offered sacrifice, and then entered Babylon to sacrifice to the great god Marduk, also visiting Borsippa, where he offered sacrifices to Nabu. It is not to be doubted that by these presentations of sacrifices Shalmaneser intended not only to show his piety and devotion to the gods, but also to display himself as the legitimate overlord of the country. Having paid these honors to the gods, he then marched down into Chaldea and attacked the rebels. He took several cities, and completely overcame Marduk-bel-usate and compelled him to pay tribute. From this time forward until the end of his reign Marduk-nadin-shum ruled peacefully in Babylon under the protectorate of Assyria.¹ By this campaign the king of Assyria had once more become the real ruler of Babylonia, the Chaldeans by their inaction acknowledging the hopelessness of any present rebellion.

We have traced in logical rather than in chronological order the campaigns of Shalmane-

¹ Synchronistic History, col. iii, 25–iv, 14; Obelisk, lines 73–84; Balawât, iv, i–vi, 8.

ser from the beginning to the close of the thirty-first year of his reign. At this point all record of his reign breaks off, and for the closing years we are confined to the information derived from the records of his son, Shamshi-Adad IV. There are no more records of Shalmaneser's doings in the last years of his reign, because they were too troubled to give any leisure for the erection of such splendid monuments as those from which our knowledge of his earlier years has been derived. In the year 827 B. C. there was a rebellion led by Shalmaneser's own son, Asshur-danin-apli. We know but little of it, and that little, as already said, derived from the brief notices of it preserved in the inscriptions of Shamshi-Adad IV. We have no direct means of learning even the cause of the outbreak. Neither can we find an explanation of the great strength of the rebels, nor understand its sudden collapse when apparently it was in the ascendant. Wars of succession have always been so common in the Orient that, failing any other explanation, we are probably safe in the suggestion that Shalmaneser had probably provided by will, or decree, that Shamshi-Adad should succeed him. Asshur-danin-apli attempted by rebellion to gain the throne for himself, and the strange thing was that he was followed in his rebellion by the better part of the kingdom. The capital city, Calah, remained faithful to the king, but Nineveh, Asshur, Arbela, among the older cities, and the chief colonies, a total of twenty-seven

cities, joined the forces of Asshur-danin-apli. It is difficult to account for the strength of this rebellion, unless, perhaps, the leader of it was really the elder son, and a sense of fairness and justice in the people overcame their allegiance to their sovereign. The struggle began in 827, and before the death of Shalmaneser, in 825 B. C., the kingdom for which he had warred so valiantly had been split into two discordant parts, of which Shalmaneser was able to hold only the newly won provinces in the north and west, together with the land of Babylonia. The old Assyrian homeland was in the hand of the rebels, and all the signs seemed to indicate that Babylonia would soon regain complete independence and that the Aramaean peoples would be able to throw off their onerous yoke. After the death of Shalmaneser, Shamshi-Adad spent two more years in civil war before he was acknowledged as the legitimate king of Assyria. We do not know what it was that gave him the victory, but a complete victory it was, and we hear no more of the rebels or their leader.¹

The civil war had brought dire consequences upon the kingdom which Asshurnazirpal had made great, and Shalmaneser had held to its allegiance for thirty-one long years. It was therefore necessary, as soon as his title to the throne was everywhere recognized, for Shamshi-Adad to un-

¹ Inscription of Shamshi-Adad (I R. 29-31), col. i, 39-53. See translation by Abel in *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, i, pp. 174-187.

dertake such campaigns as would secure to him the loyalty of the wavering and doubtful, and would overcome the openly rebellious or disaffected. His first campaign was directed against the troublesome lands of Nairi, which may have been planning an uprising to free themselves from the tribute. Shamshi-Adad entered the land and received their tribute without being required to strike a blow. He must have forestalled any organized resistance. The promptness with which the campaign was undertaken and the completeness of its success make it seem probable that Shamshi-Adad had had from the beginning the support of the standing army of Assyria. If this were the case, we can the better understand how the rebellion against him was put down even when the greater part of the country had embraced the fortunes of Asshur-danin-apli, for the commercial classes of Assyria could not stand against the disciplined, hardened veterans of Shalmaneser. As soon as the danger in the Nairi lands had been overcome Shamshi-Adad marched up and down over the entire land of Assyria, "from the city of Paddir in the Nairi to Kar-Shulmanasharid of the territory of Carchemish; from Zaddi of the land of Accad to the land of Enzi; from Aridi to the land of Sukhi,"¹ and over the whole territory the people bowed in submission to him. This is the first instance in Assyrian history of a king's marching from point to point in his own dominions to re-

¹ Inscription of Shamshi-Adad (I R. 29-31), col. ii, 7-15.

ceive protestations of allegiance. It shows clearly to what unrest the land had come during the civil war.

The second campaign was undertaken chiefly, if not wholly, for the collection of tribute. Its course was directed first into the land of Nairi and thence westward to the Mediterranean. Cities in great numbers were devastated and burned, and the territory against which Shalmaneser had so long made war was brought again to feel the Assyrian power.¹ The leader in this campaign was Mutarris-Asshur.

The third campaign, likewise in search of booty, was directed against the east and north. The lands of Khubushkia and Parsua were crossed, and the journey led thence to the coasts of Lake Urumiyeh, and then into Media. In Media, as in the other lands, tribute and gifts were abundantly given. Again the Nairi lands were overrun, and the king returned to Assyria, assured only that the tribute would be paid as long as he was able to enforce it.²

In the next year of his reign Shamshi-Adad was compelled to invade Babylonia. The years of the Assyrian civil war had given that land the coveted opportunity to claim independence. Marduk-nadin-shum had been succeeded in Babylon by Marduk-balatsu-iqbi (about 812 B. C.), though the exact year of the change is unknown to us. He

¹ *Ibid.*, ii, 16-34.

² *Ibid.*, ii, 34-iii, 24.

paid no Assyrian tribute, and in all things acted as an independent ruler. Against him Shamshi-Adad marched. His course into Babylonia was not down the Mesopotamian valley, as one might have expected. He went east of the Tigris along the edge of the mountains. He seems not to have made a hasty march, for he boasts of having killed three lions and of having destroyed cities and villages on the way. The river Turnat was crossed at flood. At Dur-Papsukal, in northern Babylonia, he was met by Marduk-balatsu-iqbi and his allies. The Babylonian army consisted of Babylonians, Chaldeans, Elamites, Aramaeans, and men of Namri, and was therefore composed of the peoples who feared the development of Assyria and were willing to unite against it, even though they were usually common enemies. Shamshi-Adad claims to have won a great victory, in which five thousand of his enemies were slain and two thousand taken captive. One hundred chariots and even the Babylonian royal tent fell into the hands of the victor.¹ We may, however, well doubt whether the victory was so decisive. The only inscription which we possess of Shamshi-Adad breaks off abruptly at this point. But the Eponym List shows that in 813 he again invaded Chaldea, while in 812 he invaded Babylon. These two supplementary campaigns would seem to indicate that he had not achieved his entire purpose in the battle of Dur-Papsukal. It is indeed unlikely that

¹ *Ibid.*, col. iv, 1-24.

he succeeded in restoring the conditions which prevailed in the reign of Shalmaneser, though his short reign was, on the whole, successful. If he had not had the civil war to quell and its consequences to undo, he might well have made important additions to the territory of Assyria.

Shamshi-Adad was succeeded by his son, Adad-nirari III (811–783 B. C), whose long reign was filled with important deeds. Unfortunately, however, we are not able to follow his campaigns in detail because his very few fragmentary inscriptions give merely the names of the countries which he plundered, without giving the order of his marches or any details of his campaigns. In 806, in 805, and in 797 he made expeditions to the west in which he claims to have received tribute and gifts from the land of the Hittites, from Tyre, Sidon, the land of Omri,¹ Edom, and Philistia to the Mediterranean. On this same expedition he besieged Damascus and received from it great booty. The king of Damascus was Mari; and Adad-nirari could scarcely have had a greater triumph than the humbling of the proud state which had marshaled so many allied armies against the advance of the Assyrians and had then held out single-handed so long against them. These expeditions to the west accomplished little more of importance. It was no new thing to receive trib-

¹“The land of Omri” is the usual Assyrian expression for the land of Israel, during a long period. Omri made so deep an impression upon his neighbors that his country was named after him.

ute from the unwarlike merchants of Tyre and Sidon, and the Israelites had long since become a subject people. Only Edom and Philistia are named as fresh conquests.

In the northeast also he was brilliantly successful. The Eponym Lists mention no less than eight campaigns against the Medes, and the conquests in this direction carried the king even to the Caspian Sea, to which no former Assyrian king had penetrated.

In the north he did not get beyond the limits of his ancestors. Urartu, which had so strenuously asserted and maintained its rights, was not disturbed at all, and remained an entirely independent kingdom.

In the south Adad-nirari III was entirely successful, as he had been in the west. We have already seen that there was an expedition against Babylonia in 812, and this was followed in 803 by one against the Sea Lands about the Persian Gulf. In 796 and 795 Babylonia was again invaded. One of these campaigns, but which one is uncertain, was directed against a certain Bau-akhi-iddin, of whose personality or relation to Babylon we know nothing. He may have been king in Babylon at this time, or perhaps more probably a rebellious native prince. Assyrian influence was completely reestablished by these campaigns, and Babylonia again became practically an Assyrian province. The Assyrian Synchronistic History, from which we have largely and repeatedly drawn

in the narrative of several previous kings, was edited and compiled at this time as one of the signs of the emphatic union of the two peoples. It was the purpose of Adad-nirari III to blot out completely the distinctions and differences between them. He even began an intermixture of their religions. Though the Assyrians had begun their career as a separate people with the Babylonian religion as then taught and practiced, the two peoples had diverged through historical development, and were now in many points quite different in their religious usages. The Assyrians had introduced other gods, as, for instance, Asshur, into their pantheon, while the Babylonians, who had had less contact with the outer world, had made less change. Adad-nirari III now built in Assyria temples modeled carefully on Babylonian exemplars and introduced into them the forms of Babylonian worship with all its ritual. One of the most striking instances of this policy was the construction in Calah, his capital city, of a great temple, the counterpart of the temple of Ezida in Borsippa. Into this was brought from Borsippa the worship of Nabu. The policy, strange as it was, met with a certain success, for Babylonia disappears almost wholly for a long time as a separate state and Assyria alone finds mention.

In connection with this introduction of the worship of Nabu we get a single gleam of light upon some of the mythical history of Babylonia. There has been preserved a statue of Nabu, set up in the

temple in Calah by Adad-nirari III, on the back of which is an inscription¹ containing these words: "For the life of Adad-nirari, king of Assyria, its Lord [that is, of Calah], and for the life of Sammuramat, the lady of the Palace and its Mistress." The name Sammuramat is plainly the Babylonian form of the Greek Semiramis. It may be that this Sammuramat is the original of the Semiramis of the story of Ktesias, though there is no further proof than the identity of the names—rather a slender basis for so much conjecture. It has been supposed by some that Sammuramat was the mother of the king, who ruled as regent during the earlier portion of the king's reign, for he must have been but little more than a lad when he became king. Others believe that Semiramis was the wife of the king, and perhaps a Babylonian princess. Either of these rôles would have given her an opportunity for great deeds out of which the legend reported by Ktesias might easily grow, but it is impossible, in the present state of knowledge, to decide between them.²

The reign of Adad-nirari III must be included in any list of the greatest reigns of Assyrian history. No Assyrian king before him had actually ruled over so wide an extent of territory, and none

¹ I R. 35, No. 2, Abel-Winckler, *Keilschrifttexte*, p. 14. Two specimens of the Nabu statue with the same inscription are in the British Museum.

² Tiele (*Geschichte*, pp. 212, 213) holds Sammuramat to be the mother rather than the wife, and Hommel (*Geschichte*, pp. 630, ff.) follows this view, giving his reasons for its holding. On the other hand, Winckler (*Geschichte*, p. 120, 1) holds to the view that she was the king's wife.

had ever possessed, in addition to this, so extensive a circle of tribute-paying states. Though he had done little in the northeast and nothing in the north, he had immensely increased Assyrian prestige in the west, and in the south Babylonia, with all its traditions of glory and honor, had become an integral part of his dominions.

After his reign there comes slowly but surely a period of strange, almost inexplicable, decline. Of the next three reigns we have no single royal inscription, and are confined to the brief notes of the Eponym Lists. From these we learn too little to enable us to follow the decline of Assyrian fortunes, but we gain here and there a glimpse of it, and see also not less vividly the growth of a strong northern power which should vex Assyrian kings for centuries.

The successor of Adad-nirari III was Shalmaneser III (782–773), to whom the Eponym Lists ascribe ten campaigns. Some of these were of little consequence. One was against the land of Namri, an eastern tributary country of which we have heard much in previous reigns. It had probably not paid the regular tribute, which had therefore to be collected in the presence of an army. No less than six of the campaigns were directed against the land of Urartu. We know nothing directly of these campaigns and their results. But the history of a time not very distant shows that these campaigns were more than the usual tribute-collecting and plundering expeditions. They were

rather the ineffectual protests of Assyria against the growth of a kingdom which was now strong enough to prevent any further Assyrian tribute collecting within its borders, and would soon be able to wrench from Assyrian control the fair lands of Nairi. A loss so great as that might well give the Assyrian kings cause for anxiety and for desperate efforts to hinder the development of the enemy. This loss of tributary territory in the north had apparently already begun in this reign, but there were no other losses of territory elsewhere, and the reign ended with the substantial external integrity of the empire which Asshurnazirpal had won.

The next king was Asshur-dan III (772–755), in whose reign the decay of Assyrian power was rapid, in spite of strenuous efforts to maintain it, and in spite of success in its maintenance in certain places. In the year 773, when his reign actually began, though, according to Assyrian reckoning, 772 was the first official year, he led a campaign against Damascus. In 772 and again in 755 he marched against Khatarikka in Syria. These three western campaigns show that, however much Assyria had lost in the north, it had not yet given up any claim on the prosperous lands beyond the Euphrates. And the two invasions of Babylonia—771 and 767—are evidence of the same facts as regards that land. Asshur-dan III was plainly endeavoring to hold all that his fathers had won, but he had as yet undertaken no campaigns against

any new territory. Whatever he may have planned or intended to do in that way was made impossible by a series of rebellions in Assyrian territory. The first of these began in 763 in the city of Asshur, the ancient political and religious center of the kingdom. We do not know its origin, but the general character of ancient oriental rebellions and the succession of events which immediately follow in this story make it seem probable that some pretender had attempted to seize the throne. The attempt failed for the present and the rebellion was put down in the same year.

This was shortly followed by another rebellion, also of unknown cause, in the province of Arpakha, known to the Greeks as Arrapachitis,¹ a territory on the waters of the Upper Zab. While a third at Guzunu, in the land of the Khabur, took place in 759 and 758. These rebellions were signs of the changes that were impending, and could not long be delayed.

To the superstition of the Assyrians there were other omens than defeats and losses in war, which must have seemed to indicate the approach of troublous days. In 763 the Eponym List records an eclipse of the sun in the month of Sivan. To the Assyrians this was probably an event of doubt and concern. To modern students it has been of great importance, because the astronomical determination has given us a sure point of departure

¹ Λρραπαχιτις, Ptol. vi, 1, 2.

for Assyrian chronology. In 759 there was a pestilence, another omen of gloom.

The reign of Asshur-nirari II (754-745) was a period of peaceful decadence. In 754 he conducted a campaign against Arpad, and in 749 and 748 there were two expeditions against the land of Namri. With these expeditions the king made no effort to collect his tribute or to retain the vast territory which his fathers had won. Year after year the Eponym List has nothing to record but the phrase "in the country," meaning thereby that the king was in Assyria and not absent at the head of his armies.

In 746 there was an uprising in the city of Calah. We know nothing of its origin or progress. But in it Asshur-nirari II disappears and the next year begins with a new dynasty. In the person of Asshur-nirari II ended the career of the great royal family which had ruled the fortunes of Assyria for centuries.

CHAPTER VI.

THE REIGNS OF TIGLATHPILESER III AND SHALMANESER IV.

A MARVELOUS change in Assyria was wrought by the rebellion of 746 B. C. Before it there reigned the last king of a dynasty which had made the kingdom great and its name feared from east to west. A degenerate son of a distinguished line was he, and the power which had swept with a force almost resistless over mountain and valley was a useless thing in his hands. He remained in his royal city while the fairest provinces were taken away and added to the kingdom of Urartu, and while others boldly refused to pay tribute and defied his waning army. After 746 B. C. the Assyrian throne is occupied by a man whose very name before that time is so obscure and unworthy as to be discarded by its owner. We do not know the origin of this strange man, for in the pride of later years he never mentioned either father or mother, who were probably humble folk not dwelling in kings' houses. He was perhaps an army commander; an officer who had led some part of the greatest standing army that the world had then known. He may also have held a civil post as governor of some province or

district. In his career that was now to begin he displayed both military and civil ability of such high order that we are almost driven to believe that he had been schooled by experience in both branches of effort. His reign was not very long, so that he probably gained the throne comparatively late in life, at a time when the power of adaptation is less strong than in youth, when the years of a man's life are devoted rather to the display of powers already acquired than to the development of new ones. We do not know whether he set on foot the rebellion which dethroned Asshur-nirari II or merely turned to his own purposes an uprising brought about by others. In either case he acted with decision, for he was crowned king in 745, the next year after the rebellion. He was well known as a man of resources and of severity, for no rebellion against him arose, and no pretender dared attempt to drive him from power. He spent no time in marching through the land to overawe possible opponents, but at once began operations outside the boundaries of the old kingdom. That he should dare to leave his capital and his country immediately after his proclamation shows how sure he was of his own ability, and how confident that his personal popularity or his reputation for severe discipline would maintain the peace. Whatever the name of his youth and manhood may have been he was proclaimed under the name and style of Tiglathpileser, adopting as his own the name which had been

made famous by the great Assyrian conqueror, whom he emulated in the number and success of his campaigns, and greatly surpassed in the permanency of the results obtained. The name of Tiglathpileser would undoubtedly strengthen him in the popular mind; for it is beyond question that in a land like Assyria, in which writing, even in the earliest times, was so constantly practiced, some acquaintance with the history of their kings was diffused among even the common people. He was plainly not a descendant of the kings who preceded him, or he would certainly have followed the usual custom of Assyrian kings and set down the names of his ancestors with all their titles. He alludes indeed to "the kings, my fathers,"¹ but this is a boast without meaning when unaccompanied by the names.

There is another proof of his humble origin to be found in the contemptuous treatment of his monumental inscriptions by a later king. Tiglath-pileser restored, for his occupancy, the great palace erected by Shalmaneser II in Calah. Upon the walls of its great rooms he set up slabs of stone upon which were beautifully engraved inscriptions recounting the campaigns of his reign. When Esarhaddon came to build his palace he stripped from the walls these great slabs of Tiglathpileser that he might use them for his own inscriptions. He caused his workmen to plane off their edges, so destroying both beginning and ending of some in-

¹ Annals, lines 19; clay tablet, line 26 (II R. 67).

scriptions, and purposed then to have his own records carved upon them. He died without entirely completing his purpose, or we should have been left almost without annalistic accounts of the events of the reign of Tiglathpileser. Such treatment as this was never given to any royal inscriptions before, and we may justly see in it a slight upon the memory of the great plebeian king.

Were it not for the vandalism of the king Esarhaddon we should be admirably supplied with historical material for the reign of Tiglathpileser. He left behind him no less than three distinct classes of inscriptions.¹ Of these the first class consist of the stone inscriptions, in which the events of the reign are narrated in chronological order. These, the most important of his inscriptions, are in a bad state of preservation through the mutilations of Esarhaddon. The second class of the in-

¹The chief inscription material of the reign of Tiglathpileser III is the following: (a) The Annals, badly defaced by Esarhaddon, the most legible portions of which are published by Layard, *Inscriptions in the Cuneiform Char.*, plates 34a, etc., and afterward much more accurately by Paul Rost, *Die Keilschrifttexte Tiglat-Pileser III*, vol. ii, plates i-xviii. He has also carefully arranged and translated them into German, *ibid.*, i, pp. 2-41. (b) The Slabs of Nimroud, published first by Layard, *op. cit.*, plates 17, 18, and Rost, i, plates xxix-xxxiii. They are well translated by Rost, i, pp. 42-53, and by Schrader, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, ii, pp. 2-9. (c) The clay tablets are as follows: 1. British Museum, K. 3751, published II R. 67, and Rost, ii, plates xxxv-xxxviii, and translated by him, i, pp. 54-77. 2. British Museum, DT. 3, a duplicate of K. 3751, published by Schrader, *Abh. Preuss. Ak. d. W.*, 1879, No. viii, plate i and accompanying photograph, and also by Rost, ii, plate xxxiv. There is an English translation of K. 3751 by S. Arthur Strong in *Records of the Past*, New Series, v, pp. 115, ff. (d) The smaller inscriptions, which contain simply lists of places conquered, are: 1. III R. 10, No. 2, and Rost, ii, plate xxvii, translated i, pp. 84, 85, and 2. British Museum, K. 2649, Rost, ii, plate xxiv, C., transliterated i, p. 86.

scriptions, written upon clay, give accounts of the king's campaigns grouped in geographical order; while the third class, also on clay, give mere lists of the countries conquered without details of any kind. If all this abundant material had been as carefully preserved as the inscriptions of Asshurnazirpal, we should be able to present a clear view of the entire reign. As it is, questions of order sometimes arise which render difficult the setting forth of a consecutive narrative.

It was in the month of Airu 745 B. C. that Tiglathpileser III (745–727) ascended the throne. As the year had but just begun, this was counted, contrary to the usual custom, as the first year of the reign. In the month of September he set out upon his first campaign, which was directed against Babylonia. In Babylonia there had also been dull days, while the Assyrian power was dwindling away. After Marduk-balatsu-iqbi there reigned Bau-akh-iddin, of whom later days seemed to have preserved no recollection save that he was a contemporary of Adad-nirari III. If monuments of his reign are still in existence, they are concealed in the yet unexplored mounds of his country. After him Babylonia had two, or perhaps even three, kings whose names as well as their deeds are lost to us. If there had arisen in Babylonia at that time a king such as the land had seen before, a man of action and of courage, independence might probably have been achieved without a struggle. But instead of that the

kingdom fell into fresh bondage. The nomadic Aramæans, communities of whom had given so much trouble to the Assyrians, had invaded Babylonia from the south and taken possession of important cities like Sippar and Dur-Kurigalzu. So powerful and numerous were they that they threatened to engulf the country and blot out the civilization of Babylonia. After the loss of two or three names we come again upon the name of Nabu-shum-ishkun, who reigned, how long we do not know, in this period of Babylonian decline. He was succeeded in 747 by Nabu-nasir, commonly known as Nabonassar (747–734 B. C.). Like his predecessors, he was unable to control the Aramæans, and when Tiglathpileser III entered the land he was acclaimed as a deliverer.¹ The march of the new Assyrian king southward had been a continuous victory. He moved east of the Tigris along the foothills of the mountains of Elam, conquering several nomadic tribes such as the Puqudu and the Li'tan. He then turned westward and attacked Sippar, overcoming its Aramaean intruders, and doing a like service to Dur-Kurigalzu. He marched south as far as Nippur and there turned about.² By this campaign he had so thoroughly disciplined the Aramaean invaders and

¹ Some assyriologists (for example, Tiele, *Geschichte*, pp. 217, 218; Rost, *Die Keilschrifttexte Tiglat-Pileser III*, i, pp. 13, 14) have held that Tiglathpileser was considered an enemy, but the expressions in his texts seem to me to point to a pacific reception. So also Hommel (*Geschichte*, pp. 651, 652) and Winckler (*Geschichte*, pp. 121–123, 222, 223).

² Annals, lines 1–25; clay tablet, 1–13.

overcome all discordant elements that he was able to give a new order of government and life to the state.

It is a striking commentary on the political and civil ability of this extraordinary man that he was able to begin a new order of administration for subject territory in the first year of his reign, and as a part of his first campaign. He had reconquered Babylonia as far south as Nippur, for Babylonian and Assyrian control over it had practically been lost. He was not satisfied with the payment of a heavy tribute, but reorganized the whole government of the territory. He first subdivided it into four provinces, placing Assyrian governors over them, and then built two cities as administrative centers. The first of these was called Kar-Asshur, located near the Zab. The name of the second is not given in the Annals, but it was probably Dur-Tukulti-apal-esarra.¹ These were made royal residences, each being provided with a palace for the king's occupancy. The second was required to pay the great tribute of ten talents of gold and one thousand talents of silver. In each the king set up a monument, with his portrait as a sign of the dominion which he claimed, and in both people from the other conquered districts were settled. This plan of planting colonies and of transporting captives from place to place had indeed been tried on a small

¹ Comp. Rost, *Keilschrifttexte Tiglat-Pileser III* (Leipzig, 1893), i, p. 7, note 1.

scale by other Assyrian kings, but it had never been adopted as a fixed and settled policy. From this time onward we shall meet with it frequently. Tiglathpileses III consistently followed it during his whole reign, trying thereby to break down national feeling, and to sever local ties in order that the mighty empire which he founded might be in some measure homogeneous.

When the Aramaean nomads had been overcome and the land had received its new order of government, the king offered sacrifices in Sippar, Nippur, Babylon, Borsippa, and in other less important cities, to Marduk, Bel, Nabu, and other gods. It was a fruitful year. Never before had the land of Babylonia been brought into such complete subjection to Assyria. Nabonassar was a king only in name; the real monarch lived in Calah. So small indeed is his influence from the Assyrian point of view that he is not even mentioned in Tiglathpileser's accounts of the campaign; he is simply ignored as though he was not. To such sad contempt had come a man who was nominally king of Babylon. Yet, though thus despised by the Assyrian overlord, Nabonassar is still called king by the Babylonians, who held control of the national records. In them it is still his name and not his conqueror's which stands in the honored list of Babylon's rulers.

Having thus left affairs in a safe condition in the south, Tiglathpileser III next turned his attention to the troublesome lands east of Assyria. We have

already seen how frequently the Assyrian kings had to invade their territory in order to collect the unwillingly paid tribute. The first of these lands to be invaded was Namri. The Assyrian people who lived along their own borders and hence close to Namri had suffered much from the incursions of half-barbaric hordes which swept down from the mountains and plundered their crops and other possessions. These movements in and through Namri made up a situation similar to that which Tiglathpileser had just settled in Babylonia. The march through Namri and thence northward through Bit-Zatti, Bit-Abdadani, Arziah, and other districts to Nishai was marked by ruins and burning heaps. But the entire campaign was not filled with works of ruin. The districts of Bit-Sumurzu and Bit-Khamban were added to the territory of Assyria and received the benefits of Assyrian government. The city of Nikur, which had been destroyed in the beginning of the campaign, was entirely rebuilt¹ and resettled with colonists brought from other conquered lands. This became, therefore, a center around which Assyrian influences might crystallize. The campaign was fruitful in definite results, as the expeditions of Asshurnazirpal, seeking only plunder, never could be. The king did not personally enter the heart of Media, but sent an army under command of Asshur-dan-nani to punish the tribes south of the Caspian Sea; but to follow its marches is beyond our pres-

¹ Annals, line 36.

ent geographical knowledge.¹ A second expedition² into Media was necessary in 737, when the process of settling colonists in troublesome districts was further carried out. No such control over Indo-European inhabitants of the mountain lands of Media was, however, achieved as had been secured over the Semites of Babylonia, and Media remained practically independent and ready to give trouble to later Assyrian kings, and even to have an important share in the breaking up of the monarchy which was now harrying it.

But if Tiglathpileser was confronted by a difficult situation in Babylonia and a more difficult one in Media, and the lands between it and Assyria, his difficulties may justly be said to have been colossal when one views the state of affairs in the north. As we have already seen, the weakness and decadence of Assyria after the reign of Shalmaneser II had given a great opportunity to Urartu, and kings of force and ability had arisen in the land to seize it. Of the kings of Urartu Argistis had taken from Assyria the hard-won lands of Dayaëni and Nirbi, and had overrun, plundering and burning, the whole great territory lying north of Assyria proper, and as far east as Parsua, east of Lake Urumiyeh.³

Great though these conquests undoubtedly were,

¹ Annals, lines 26-58.

² Annals, lines 157, ff.

³ See the great historical inscription of Argistis, translated by Sayee, *Records of the Past*, New Series, vol. iv, pp. 117, ff.

and dangerous as was the threat against Assyrian power, they were far surpassed in the reign of Sarduris II, who succeeded Argistis, while Asshurdan III was impotently ruling in Assyria. Sarduris broke down and destroyed the whole circle of tribute-paying states dependent upon Assyria in the north. His conquests and annexations to the kingdom of Urartu or Chaldia continued in a westerly direction until he had overrun the most northern parts of Syria, comprising the territory north of the Taurus and west of the Euphrates. He even claimed the title of king of Suri—that is, of Syria. His next move was the formation of an alliance with Matilu of Agusi, Sulumal of Melid, Tarkhulara of Gurgum, Kushtashpi of Kummukh, and with several other northern princes, among them probably Panammu of Sam'al and Pisiris of Carchemish. These princes probably did not give a willing ear to the solicitations of Sarduris II, as a neighboring friendly prince, for a defensive alliance against the encroachments of the powerful Assyrian kingdom, but were rather forced into such an alliance. Accompanied by these allies, whether of their own will or not, Sarduris marched against the west. The inscriptions which have come down to us render it exceedingly difficult to follow perfectly the movements in this campaign, but the following is the probable order and meaning of them. At about the same time of Sarduris's march westward Tiglathpileser also invaded the west, directing his attack against the

city of Arpad—the real key of the northern part of Syria. It had belonged to Assyria, as a tribute-paying state, but now actually formed part of the new kingdom of Urartu. If Tiglathpileser could restore it to his kingdom, he would make a long step forward in the restoration of Assyrian prestige in all the west. He besieged the city and could probably have reduced it. Sarduris did not come directly to its aid, but instead threatened Assyria itself, and so forced Tiglathpileser to raise the siege and return by forced marches. On his return he crossed the Euphrates, probably below Til-Barsip, and he then turned northward. The two armies met in the southeastern part of Kum-mukh between Kishtan and Khalpi, and Sarduris was forced to retire. Tiglathpileser pursued, destroying as he went the cities of Izzida, Qnqusanshu, and Kharbisina, until he reached the Euphrates north of Amid.¹ Here the pursuit ended, for he did not cross the river, whether because he thought his purpose fully accomplished or because his army was too weak for the venture we do not know.

The result of this conflict was overpowering, and its direct consequences are to be seen in the next three campaigns. From Sarduris the Assyrians took a great mass of spoil in camp equipage and in costly stuffs and precious metals, together with a large number of captives. In the enumer-

¹ Annals, lines 59–73. See Rost, *op. cit.*, i, pp. 12–15, and, for the parallel accounts, also pp. 50–53, and 66–69.

ation of these trophies there is probably gross exaggeration, but there is no reason to doubt the truth of the main fact that a very great victory was won. The moral effect of it was far more important than all the gain in treasure. The allies of Sarduris at once sent presents and tribute to Tiglathpileser, and the entire Syrian country was once more opened to Assyrian invasion without fear of opposition from Urartu. There is a curious parallel in all this to the resistance offered by Damascus and its allies to Shalmaneser II.¹ As soon as the alliance which Ben-Hadad II had formed lost its cohesiveness Syria was speedily ravaged by Shalmaneser.² In the latter case a most promising alliance had been formed under the leadership of Sarduris. If the selfish commercial interests of the Phoenicians could have been laid aside, and if the Syrian states had once more heartily united, the Assyrians would have been easily overcome and the west saved from all immediate danger of Assyrian invasion. But these petty unions, which dissolved after the striking of one blow, were more harmful than useful. By them the Assyrians were only maddened, and their natural thirst for booty and commercial expansion increased to a passion. The cities which participated in the alliances were ruthlessly destroyed in revenge, and fertile countries laid waste.

In the next year (742 B. C.) Tiglathpileser, free

¹ See above, pp. 78-80.

² See p. 83.

from all fear of interference from Urartu,¹ undertook the reduction of Arpad. He could make no further gains in Syria until that city was overcome, for the rich cities along the Mediterranean could not be expected to fear the Assyrians and to pay tribute so long as a city smaller in size and nearer to Assyria held out against the eastern power. We know nothing of the details of the siege. It was prolonged in a most surprising fashion, for Arpad did not fall until 740. Our ignorance of the two years' siege probably spares us the knowledge of barbarous scenes, of the slaughter of helpless women and children, of the flaying of men alive, and of the impaling of others on stakes about the city walls. It is not to be supposed that a city which had so long resisted the great god Asshur and the king whom he had sent would come off lightly. The fall of Arpad was the signal for the prompt appearance before Tiglathpileser of messengers from nearly all the neighboring states with presents of gold and silver, of ivory, and of purple robes. In the city of Arpad he received these gifts, and with them the homage of all the west, which would endure any amount of shame and ignominy, and desired only to be left alone. One state only sent no presents and offered no homage. Tutammu, king of Unqi, alone dared to resist Assyria. Unqi was at this time but a

¹ Sarduris was not strong enough to leave his mountain passes. His relation to all these attacks of the Assyrians has been finely treated in detail by Belek and Lehmann ("Chaldische Forschungen" in *Verhandlungen der Berl. anthropol. Gesell.*, 1895, pp. 325-336).

small state probably nearly coterminous with the state of Patin, between the Afrin and the Orontes.¹ Tiglathpileser at once invaded his country and took the capital, Kinalia, which was utterly destroyed. The defiant king was taken prisoner, and his little kingdom, provided with Assyrian governors,² was made a part of the Assyrian empire which Tiglathpileser was now forming. This little episode furnished a new point to the moral of Arpad which would not be lost on the other states of Syria.

The west had been severely punished and might be left to meditation for a time. In 739 Tiglathpileser set out to win back to Assyria a part of the lands of Nairi which had fallen under the control of Urartu. We have no accounts of the campaign, and know only that Ulluba and Kilkhi, two districts of Nairi, were taken. These were not plundered according to the former fashion, but actually incorporated with Assyria, and provided with an Assyrian governor, who made his residence in the lately built city of Asshur-iqisha. Another campaign against the same districts was made in 736 B. C. This carried the conquests up to Mount Nal, and so to the very borders of Urartu. It is perfectly clear that both these campaigns were but preparatory to an invasion of

¹ Comp. Tomkins (*Bab. and Orient. Record*, iii, 6) for identification of Unqi with Amq, and see Rost (*Tiglathpileser*, i, p. xxi, note 1) for the extent of Unqi.

² Annals, lines 92–101.

Urartu, which was plainly already planned and soon to be attempted. These two campaigns were meant only to weaken the southern defenses of Urartu. Perhaps the king, even in 739 or in 738, would have attempted to follow up the victories which he had gained but for the breaking out of rebellions in Syria and along the Phœnician coast. The whole development of Assyrian policy with reference to Syria and Palestine is so intensely interesting for many reasons that it is unfortunate that we are left with such fragmentary lines at the very point in the Annals where the events of this important year are narrated. We must again resort to conjecture for the defining of the order of events, though the main facts are clear enough.

Among the princes and kings who formed a combination to refuse to pay Assyrian tribute and to resist its collection by force, if necessary, Azariah, or Uzziah, of Judah, seems to have been very influential, if not an actual leader, exercising a sort of hegemony over the other states of Palestine and Syria. To support him the states of Hamath, Damascus, Kummukh, Tyre, Gebal, Que, Melid, Carchemish, Samaria, and others to the total number of nineteen had banded together. It was certainly a most promising coalition. If the forces which these states were able to put into the field were brought together and beaten into warlike shape by a leader of men and a skillful soldier, there was good reason to hope for an annihilation of the army of Tiglathpileser. There is no reason

to doubt that Uzziah (Azariah) was equal to the task, colossal though it was, if he had a loyal support from his allies, and if all would make common cause against their oppressor. We can only watch and see the end of effectual opposition to Assyria through the weakness of some members of this alliance. Tiglathpileser came west, and, passing by the countries of some of the allies, started southward into Palestine, making as though he would enter Judah and attack the ringleader, Uzziah, before the allies could effectually concentrate their forces. As soon as he entered Samaria, Menahem, the king, threw down his arms and paid to the Assyrians one thousand talents of silver as a token of his acknowledgment of subjection. We do not know all the reasons for this move. It may have been necessary in order to save the land from utter destruction if no assistance could be secured elsewhere. But it looks at this distance, and on the surface, like an act of cowardice and a betrayal of the oath of confederation. The weakness or the blundering, or both, in all these western alliances becomes more evident in every successive campaign. It might well be supposed that the dread of national extinction which had been threatened in every successive Assyrian invasion would have overcome the weakness, and long use undone the blundering. On the payment of this tribute Tiglathpileser abandoned the attack on Judah and began to conquer, probably

¹ 2 Kings xv, 19, 20.

one by one, the districts which had joined in the union for defense. We have no full account of this overwhelming campaign. One city only, with the name of Kullani, possibly the biblical Kalneh,¹ is specifically mentioned as being captured, though the extent of territory actually occupied was so extensive that many must have been taken. The whole country, from Unqi and Arpad on the one side and Damascus and the Lebanon on the other, and on to the Mediterranean coast, was added to Assyrian territory and provided with an Assyrian governor. In this territory the colonizing plans of Tiglathpileser were applied on an extensive scale. Into it thirty thousand colonists were brought from the lands of Ulluba and Kilkhi, conquered in 739, while thousands were carried out of it to supply the places left vacant by the exiles. When Tiglathpileser turned his face homeward he carried with him a heavy treasure, in which were mingled the tributes of Kushtashpi of Kummukh, Rezin of Damascus, Menahem of Samaria, Hirom of Tyre, Sibittibi'li of Gebal, Urikki of Que, Pisiris of Carchemish, Enilu of Hamath, Panammu of Sam'al, Tarkhulara of Gurgum, Sulimal of Melid, Dadilu of Kask, Uassurmè of Tabal, Ushkhitti of Atun, Urballa of Tukhan, Tukhammi of Ishtunda, Urimmi of Khubishna, and of Queen Zabibi of Arabia. It is a roll not of honor, but of dishonor, and Uzziah might well have been proud that his name does

¹ Isa. x, 9, and Amos vi, 2. The exact location is unknown.

not appear upon it. Capacity and courage, with some national spirit and patriotism, in even a few of these might have saved the country, or at least postponed the evil day of its undoing.

While these events were happening in the west the policy of Tiglathpileseser was receiving in the east signal proofs of its wisdom. Among the Aramaeans east of the Tigris certain communities rose in rebellion against Assyria. Under the old régime such an uprising near the capital would have caused the liveliest concern. The king would have hurried home from his labors in the west and himself have quelled the rebellion. But Tiglathpileseser had provided the rudiments of a system of provincial government. We have already seen how ready he was at the very beginning of his reign to set up provincial governors with powers of administration over certain definite districts, and with force sufficient to maintain order. They were now responsible for the maintenance of the portion of the empire under their immediate control, and well they knew that they would be held to a strict accounting for their work. On the old method perhaps all that he had gained in the west would have been lost and all the work would have had to be begun again. In this instance, however, the Assyrian governors of Lullume and of Nairi, at the heads of armies, invaded the rebellious district and put down the uprising with the utmost severity. When this was accomplished there was another display of

colonizing activity on a colossal scale. From these turbulent districts men were deported and settled at Kinalia, the capital of Unqi, while others were settled in various parts of the new province of Syria.¹

In 735 the time had fully come for the effort to break down the kingdom of Urartu (Chaldia). We have seen how carefully this campaign was planned, and how Tiglathpileser worked up to it. Unfortunately the Annals are not preserved in which the story of the campaign was told, and we must rely again upon the looser statements of his other inscriptions. With very little opposition Tiglathpileser penetrated the country up to the gates of the capital city, Turuspa (Van). Here the people of Urartu struck a blow, but were defeated and forced to withdraw within the walls. Tiglathpileser began a siege, but could not reduce the city because he had no navy with which to attack or blockade on the lake side, and so could not starve it into submission. It was also so well fortified on the land side that he was unable to carry it by assault. While engaged in the siege he sent an army through the country, which made its way as far as Mount Birdashu, the location of which is not known. This expedition destroyed a number of cities on the Euphrates and plundered the inhabitants.

After some ineffectual fighting about the capital Tiglathpileser raised the siege and departed. He

¹ Annals, lines 134-150.

had not succeeded in adding the kingdom of Urartu to Assyria, but he had broken its spirit, and we hear no more of its power and defiance for some years. The gain to Tiglathpileser by the campaign was the removing of all danger of a flank movement from the north when he was engaged in carrying out his plans in the west, where his work was still unfinished. In 734 we find him again on the shores of the Mediterranean, having probably crossed the plains of Syria near Damascus and gone straight to the coast, which he followed southward. He had no fear of an attack in the rear from Tyre and Sidon, busily absorbed in sending out their merchant ships. It appears probable that the first city attacked was Ashdod or Ekron, which was easily taken, and then Gaza was approached. The king of Gaza at this time was Hanno (Khanunu), who had no desire to meet the Assyrian conqueror, and therefore fled to Egypt, leaving the city to stand if it were attacked. He hoped to secure the help of the Egyptians in opposing the Assyrian advance. Again selfishness interfered with the placing of a stone in the way of Assyrian progress. If the Egyptians had had any wise conception of the situation in western Asia at this period, they would have seen that the very highest self-interest demanded the giving of help to the weak city of Gaza. Gaza was the last fortified city on the way to Egypt from the north. It would serve well as a place for the defense of the Egyptian borders, for who

could say, after the events of the past few years, when Tiglathpileser III would plan to attack Egypt? Indeed who could say that this man who planned so far in advance of events had not already purposed an invasion of the land of the Nile? One by one the coalitions formed against him in Syria had been broken down. A wise policy in Egypt would have aided these combinations in order to keep a buffer state, or a series of them, between Egypt and the ever-widening power of Assyria. It was too late for that. All but Judah were paying a regular tribute to Assyria. The last outpost on the coast—the city of Gaza—was now threatened. It was surely well to make a stand here, and it would probably have been easy to inspire in Judah, or even in Damascus and Hamath, the enthusiasm for another attempt against the Assyrians. But Gaza was foolishly left to its fate, and that was easy to foresee. The city was taken; its goods and its gods were taken away to Assyria. In its royal palace Tiglathpileser set up his throne and his image in stone in token of another land added to Assyria. A native prince was appointed as a puppet king, whose chief concern must have been the collection of the heavy annual tribute for Assyria. The worship of the god Asshur was introduced along with that of the other gods native to the place.¹ One only of the

¹The inscription material for this campaign is badly preserved. The chief source is III R. No. 2, lines 8–11. See, for valuable discussion of the order of the campaign, Rost, *Tiglathpileser*, i, pp. xxviii, ff.

methods of Tiglathpileser for the engrafting of a new state into his empire seems not to have been exhibited—there was no colonization. The capture of Gaza seems but a small result for the campaigns of a year, for the taking of Ashkelon and Ekron, with places like Ri'raba, Ri'sisu, Gal'za, and Abilakka, can scarcely be counted as of much moment. In reality, however, the place was a very important outpost for Assyria. It would have been important for Egypt in the cause of defense, it was no less important for Assyria in the cause of offense, and we shall see shortly that it was thus used, and very effectively.

Tiglathpileser had now disposed of the seacoast, and would be ready and free to attend to the reduction of the inland hill country of Palestine, which he had long been coveting. His plans had been well laid, and thus far admirably executed. He might safely have hoped for complete success as the direct result of his own prudence and skill, and without external assistance of any kind. But assistance he was to have through the tactless blundering of those who ought to have opposed him. Affairs were now in a very different state in Palestine from that in which they had been when his last attempt had been made, and Uzziah offered a manly and almost successful resistance. Uzziah had died in 736, and his son, Jotham, had ruled only two pitiful years and then left a weakened kingdom to Ahaz, who was only a boy when he ascended the throne. It would have been

no difficult task for Pekah, king of Samaria, and Rezin, king of Damascus, to have shown him the need of a new alliance against Assyria.

We have paused often before over these diminishing opportunities for union against Assyria. It is well for the entire understanding of the situation that we pause again at this point. Ahaz was a weakling—of that the sequel leaves no doubt whatever; but he was also stiff-necked and unwilling to take counsel, however excellent. The wisdom of the prophet Isaiah, who was also an acute statesman, was lost on him. But in the nature of the case a man who, like him, gave little heed to the religion of Jehovah would be less likely to listen to a prophet's words than to the words of foreign kings. His introduction of the manners, customs, and worship of foreign nations shows how open he was to outside influences.¹ Coward though he was personally, he was king of a land with great resources for defensive war, as Uzziah had sufficiently shown. The way was again open for alliances which should include at least Damascus, Israel, and Judah. But the people of Damascus and of Israel were blind to all these opportunities, and saw only an opportunity for present personal gain. Menahem was dead, or his previous experience with Tiglathpileses might have restrained his people from folly. His son, Pekahiah, was also dead, after a reign of only two years, and a usurper,

¹ 2 Kings xvi, 10, and comp. 2 Kings xxiii, 12. (There is a textual difficulty in the latter passage. See Benzinger, *Commentar*, on the verse.)

Pekah, was on the throne in Samaria. Rezin still reigned in Damascus. These two saw in the youth and inexperience of Ahaz a chance for revenge upon Judah and the enrichment of their own kingdoms. They united their forces and invaded Judah. So began the Syro-Ephraimitic war. They marched apparently south on the east side of Jordan, and first took Elath,¹ which Uzziah had added to the kingdom of Judah, and so greatly increased its commercial prosperity. From Elath they went northward, intending to attack Jerusalem itself and overcome Judah at the very center.

The situation was a terrible one for Ahaz. He would never be able to hold out single-handed against such foes. To whom should he turn for help? There was no help in Egypt, for Egypt had not extended help to Hanno, and was now absorbed in a life-and-death struggle with Ethiopia. There was an Assyrian party at his court which urged him to lean upon Tiglathpileser. His wisest counselor was Isaiah, but Isaiah he would not hear, and so he sent an embassy to meet Tiglathpileser and sue for help against the Syro-Ephraimitic combination. To get the necessary gifts for the winning of favor he stripped the temple and emptied his own treasure-house.² We do not know where the embassy met the Assyrian, though it was probably at some point in Syria. The gifts were presented, and Tiglathpileser at

¹ 2 Kings xvi, 6.

² 2 Kings xvi, 7, ff.

once promised his help to Ahaz. It is a marvelous story of blindness, folly, and mismanagement on the one side and of almost fiendish wisdom and cunning on the other. All these plans of Damascus and Israel to plunder and divide Judah had played into the hands of Assyria. As soon as Tiglathpileser offered his first threat against Damascus and Israel the two allies left Judah and went northward. The danger to Jerusalem was therefore ended for the time, but the trouble for the rest of the country was only begun. The troops of Damascus and Israel were not withdrawn from Judah in order to oppose Tiglathpileser with united front, but each army withdrew into its own territory, there to await the pleasure of Tiglathpileser. He decided to attack Samaria first, and in 733 the attempt was made. Tiglathpileser came down the seacoast past the tributary states of Tyre and Sidon, and turned into the plain of Esdraelon above Carmel. His own accounts fail us at this point, but the biblical narrative fills up the gap by the statement that he took Ijon, Abel-Beth-Ma'aka, Janoah, Qedesha, and Hazor, together with Gilead, Galilee, and the whole land of Naphtali.¹ It might be expected that he would now attack Samaria itself and perhaps slay the king. He was relieved of this by a party of assassins who slew Pekah, and then presented Hoshea to be made king in his place and to be subject to him.²

¹ 2 Kings xv, 29.

² 2 Kings xv, 30.

This completed the subjection of Israel, and Tiglathpileses was now able to turn to the far greater task of overcoming Damascus. Rezin was not discomfited by the conquest of Israel, and trusted that the army of Damascus, which had so glorious a record of bravery and victory, might triumph again. He met Tiglathpileses on the field of battle and was defeated, escaping very narrowly himself. The only thing that remained was to shut himself up in Damascus and withstand the siege if possible. He was soon beleaguered, with the most terrible devastation of the entire country about Damascus. Tiglathpileses boasts that he destroyed at this time five hundred and ninety-one cities, whose inhabitants, numbering thousands, were carried away, with all their possessions, to Assyria. At about the same time, and very probably during the progress of the tedious siege, Tiglathpileses sent an army into northern Arabia. A queen of Arabia, Zabibi, had paid him tribute in 738, but since then we have no hint that he received anything more. Samsi was now queen, and she refused to pay any tribute and retired before the army, attempting to entice the Assyrians into the heart of the country. When at last she was overtaken and forced to fight the Assyrians were victorious; Samsi was conquered and plundered of vast numbers of camels and oxen. An Assyrian governor was then left to watch her payment of tribute, though she was permitted to manage her own kingdom as she willed. The effect of this

victory was almost magical. From nearly the entire land of Arabia even as far south as the kingdom of the Sabaeans deputations came bearing costly gifts for Tiglathpileser. This expedition produced little of permanent value for the Assyrian empire, but was for the time, at least, a means of adding to the imperial income. At the same time tribute was received from Ashkelon, as a sign that that hardy little state desired good relations with the conqueror.

At last, about the end of 732, Damascus fell into the hands of Tiglathpileser III, and the last hope of the west was gone. Rezin was killed by his conqueror.¹ Tiglathpileser sat up his throne in the city which had so long and so bravely, although with so much unwise-dom, withstood him and his predecessors. Well might he make merry within its walls, and receive royal honors and imperial homage at the end of so long and bitter a struggle. Ahaz of Judah came and visited him there, paying honor to the foreign conqueror who had indeed saved him from Syria and Israel, but whose people could never rest satisfied while Judah was only a tribute-paying dependency and not actually a part of the empire. It is probable that other princes also paid him honor here, as they had done before. Tiglathpileser had no need to invade the west again. He had carried the bor-

¹ 2 Kings xvi, 9. A broken tablet alluding to the death of Rezin was discovered by Sir Henry Rawlinson ("Assyrian Discovery," *Athenaeum*, 1862, ii, p. 246), but it has since disappeared.

ders of Assyria far beyond any of his predecessors in that direction. By his colonizing methods he had begun the assimilation of divers populations into one common whole. He had extended the field of operations for Assyrian commerce all the way across Mesopotomia and Syria to the Phoenician cities. Had his people been native to the seacoast, he might have undertaken to snatch the commerce of the Mediterranean. But there was no need for that in his time. Some problems and difficulties must be left for the future to solve.

While this long series of campaigns was in progress in the west Babylonia was first peaceful and then disturbed. In one sense the Assyrian protectorate, while it oppressed the native sense of dignity and independence, was a great blessing. It delivered the people from the need of a great standing army, and gave them a sense of security without it. The reign of Nabonassar was an age of literary activity, especially manifested in the study of history and chronology,¹ and the leisure for such study was won by Assyrian arms. In estimating the reign of Tiglathpileser this must not be left out of the account.

With the end of the reign of Nabonassar, in 733, the period of peace abruptly closed, if, indeed, there had not been disturbances before that time. He was succeeded by his son, Nabu-nadin-zer (733–732), who was slain by a usurper, Nabu-shum-ukin, in the second year of his reign. It

¹ See above, vol. i, pp. 333, 345.

was at this time that Tiglathpileser was most deeply absorbed in delicate and difficult operations in the west. It was impossible for him to leave to other hands the conduct of the siege of Damascus, or the direction of the important, though subsidiary, expeditions in Palestine and Arabia. For a season Babylonia must be left to its own resources; which offered an opportunity to the traditional enemies of Babylonia, the Chaldeans, or Arameans. The union of tribes made a successful attack on the country when Nabu-shum-ukin had reigned only about one month. Nabu-shum-ukin was deposed, and in his place Ukinzer, a Chaldean prince of the state of Bit-Amukkani, was made king. This was in 732, and Tiglathpileser was still in camp before Damascus. With the accession of Ukinzer, Babylonian unrest almost became a frenzy. There was a traditional hatred of the Chaldeans, and they were now masters in the land, and their hand was not light in ruling. It is therefore not surprising that the priests, who were great landed proprietors, and the wealthier classes in general, who were despoiled of property by their new and hungry rulers, should have longed for the intervention of Tiglathpileser. Weary of the constant disturbances in the south, he decided to invade the land in 731, and make an end of the disturbances by giving to the people a new form of government with more perfect supervision. In his progress through the land he met first with the tribe of Silani, whose king,

Nabu-ushabshi, shut himself up in his capital, Sar-rabani. The Assyrians took the city and destroyed it. Nabu-ushabshi was impaled in front of it as a warning to rebels, while his wife, his children, and his gods, with fifty-five thousand people, were carried into captivity.¹ The cities of Tarbasu and Yabullu were next utterly wasted, and thirty thousand of their inhabitants, with all their possessions, were carried away. The next victim in this bitter campaign was Zakiru, of the tribe of Sha'alli, who was carried in chains to Assyria, while his whole land was laid waste as though a storm of wind and wave had passed over it.²

The way was now open for an attack upon the real object of the expedition. Ukinzer had left Babylon and fled to the confines of his own tribe of Amukkani, where he shut himself up in his old capital of Sapia. If Tiglathpileser expected him to surrender on demand, he was mistaken. Ukinzer prepared for a siege. The season was now probably late, as much time had been spent on the preliminary conquests, and there was not time to reduce the city by regular siege. Tiglathpileser therefore contented himself for this year with destroying the palm gardens about the city, leaving not one tree standing, and with wasting all the smaller cities and villages in the environs.³

While this process of pacification was going on

¹ II R. 67, lines 15-17.

² *Ibid.*, lines 19-22.

³ *Ibid.*, lines 22-25.

other Chaldean princes were filled with fear lest their punishment should come next, and began to take steps to set themselves right with Tiglath-pileseser. Of these Balasu (Belesys), the chief of the Dakkuri, sent gold, silver, and precious stones, as did also Nadin of Larak. But the most important of these was Merodach-baladan, of the tribe of Yakin, king of the country of the Sea Lands, close to the Persian Gulf. He had never before given any form of submission to any Assyrian king, but now came, apparently in person, to Sapia and presented an immense gift of gold, precious stones, choice woods, embroidered robes, together with cattle and sheep.¹ Great though his submission was, the end was not yet with the family of Merodach-baladan.

In the year 730 there are no events to record, but in 729 Tiglathpileser was again in Babylonia, and this time was able to take the stronghold of Sapia. Ukinzer was deposed, and the unrest of Babylonia was terminated. And now the plans which Tiglathpileser must have made years before could be fully carried out. He was determined to make an end of the ruling of Babylonia by native princes and instead govern it himself directly by making himself king. He instituted festivals in the principal Babylonian cities in honor of the great gods. In Babylon he offered sacrifices to Marduk, at Borsippa to Nabu, at Kutha to Nergal; while other offerings less magnificent were made in

¹ II R. 67, lines 26-28.

Kish, Nippur, Ur, and Sippar. He then, in Babylon, performed the great ceremony of taking the hands of Marduk.¹ By this act he was received as the son of the god and as the legitimate king of Babylon. On New Year's Day of the year 728 he was proclaimed king in the ancient city of Hammurabi. At Babylon he was crowned under the name of Pulu (Poros in the Ptolemaic canon), but whether he had borne this name before or had now adopted it in order that by change of name the Babylonians might be spared living under the name of Tiglathpileser—an Assyrian conqueror—is not known to us. This move of accepting the crown of Babylon had a great advantage and an equally great disadvantage. It would act as an effectual bar to the Chaldeans, who would not dare another outbreak while the Assyrian king was king of Babylon, with his overpowering military forces in or about the city or within easy reach. On the other hand, this crowning involved a very great difficulty. It must be renewed every year; every year must the hands of Marduk be taken. This might be almost impossible, for if there was a great insurrection at any point in the king's dominions, he would have to leave the seat of war at the time appointed and hasten to Babylon for the performance of the symbolic rite. It was not possible to transfer the

¹ Eponym Canon. See *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, i, pp. 514, 215. The last Assyrian king who had taken the hands of Marduk was Tukulti-Ninib, about 1290 B. C. See above, page 14.

capital of the empire to Babylon, for the Assyrians would have felt themselves dishonored by any such plan. Tiglathpileser must have felt sure of the stability of the empire and of the peace which he had won by the sword, or he would never have taken upon himself the burden of the crown of Babylon. In the next year, 727, he again performed the required rites and was again proclaimed king in Babylon. He had reached the very summit of the earthly magnificence of his age, and attained the goal coveted by the kings of Assyria before him. He was not only king of Sumer and Accad, but also king of Babylon.

We have no knowledge of any other important events in his reign. It was almost wholly a reign of war and conquest. We know of only one building operation, the reconstruction and improvement in Hittite style of the palace in Calah, which he occupied during most of his life, and which had been built by Shalmaneser II. In the month of Tebet of the year 727 the great king died.¹

It is difficult to estimate calmly and judiciously his reign or his character. He had come to the throne out of a rebellion. He found himself in possession of a small kingdom with tribute-paying dependencies, many in a state of unrest or of open rebellion. The name of Assyria had been made a dread and a terror among the nations by raids of almost unexampled butchery and destructiveness,

¹ Babylonian Chronicle, col. i, line 24; *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, ii, pp. 276, 277.

but it was now not feared as before. Weak kings had been unable to hold together the fragile fabric which kings great in war, though not in administration, had built up. He made this small kingdom a unit, freeing it entirely from all semblance of rebellion or insurrection. He reconquered the tribute-paying countries, and then, by a master stroke of policy, but weakly attempted in certain places before, he made them integral parts of an empire. In every true sense he was the creator of the Assyrian empire out of a kingdom and a few dependencies. He made Assyria a world power, knitting province to province by unparalleled colonizing, and transforming local into imperial sentiment. No king like him even in war had arisen in Assyria before, and in organization and administration he so far excelled them all as to be beyond comparison.

In an inscription written the year before his death he sums up the record of his empire building by the declaration that he ruled from the Persian Gulf in the south to Bikni in the east, and along the sea of the setting sun unto Egypt, and exhibits the same extent of territory in the titles which he wears, for he was then king of Kishshati, king of Assyria, king of Babylon, king of Sumer and Accad, king of the Four Quarters of the Earth. In him were thus united the titles which carried back the thought of man to the very earliest centers of civilization in the southland, to the kingdoms which had been made great by Gudea and

Hammurabi, along with those which were linked with all the story of the north. In the face of a record like this none may grudge him the titles of "great king" and "powerful king." The usurper had far outstripped men born to the purple.

In the very month¹ in which Tiglathpileser III died he was succeeded by Shalmaneser IV, who, if not his son, must have been his legal heir to the succession, or the change could not have been so quickly made. No historical inscriptions² of his reign have come down to us, and we have, therefore, very imperfect knowledge of its events, especially as the Eponym List, which has so often before helped us to make out the order of events in the reigns, is broken off at this place. The Babylonian Chronicle sets down in the year of his accession, that is, in 727, the destruction of a city, Shamara'in or Shabara'in, the biblical Sibraim,³ located between Hamath and Damascus. If this be true, we may well ask what had brought Shalmaneser so quickly after his succession into the western country. Unfortunately we do not possess his version of the story, and must derive our knowledge from his enemies, among whom the Hebrews have left

¹ Babylonian Chronicle, i, 27,

² The only records of the reign are, 1. A weight with the king's name and legend in Assyrian and Aramaean, published by Norris in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, xvi (1856), p. 220, No. 5. Translations are given in Schrader, *Cuneiform Ins. and the O. T.*, i, 127, ff., and by the same in *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, ii, p. 33. 2. A contract tablet in the British Museum (K. 407), translated by Peiser, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, iii, p. 109, 3.

³ Ezek. xlviij, 16. Halévy would identify Sibraim with the biblical Sepharvaim.

us an explicit and convincing account of his chief movements.

It will be necessary before proceeding further with the narrative of Shalmaneser's movements to fasten attention for a time upon the lands of Palestine and Egypt. When Hoshea became king of Samaria in 733-2, during the reign of Tiglath-pileser III, he accepted the post as a subject of the Assyrian monarch, and was bound in every possible way to maintain peace. There is no reason to doubt that he remained faithful to Tiglath-pileser till the great monarch died. When the change of rulers came in Assyria we may also look for disturbances among the subject states. We have learned from frequent instances that the western states accepted the domination of Assyria only at the point of the sword. They hated the conquering destructive monarchs, and yielded only when they were crushed. We have also learned that the populations subject to Assyria were always hoping for an opportunity to free themselves from the galling yoke, and we have seen in several instances that they commonly chose as an opportunity the change of rulers in Assyria. But Tiglathpilesr III had introduced a new sort of conquest and an entirely new form of administrative policy, and it was not to be expected that the opportunity for rebellion would be so great at the end of his reign as it had been before. His conquests were less destructive, less bloody, than those, for example, of Asshurnazirpal, and hence

the wounds which they made in the sensibilities of a people were less deep and angry. But further and more important than this, he not only conquered, he ruled. Provinces were not plundered and then, after being commanded to pay an annual tribute, left to themselves. They were provided with Assyrian governors, who could watch every movement of the subject populations, and so scent the very first sign of rebellion or of conspiracy looking to it. When any people had been so conquered and so administered during a king's reign they were not able easily to make a confederation when his death occurred. This was a very different situation from that which tribute-paying states had previously known. If rebellions at the change of kings were now generally less likely to occur, still more were they unlikely in Palestine, and of the land of Palestine they were in no country so improbable as in Israel. For by far the larger and better part of the kingdom was absolutely administered and ruled by Assyrians, and in part populated by colonists. The kingdom which was permitted to retain the semblance of autonomy extended but a short distance around the capital city. There was no inherent likelihood of any outbreak in Samaria, or any effort to win back again the old independence, when Tiglathpileser III died, and in the selfsame month Shalmaneser IV succeeded him.

But there was another land in the west in which great changes had come and new aspira-

tions, along with new fears, had arisen. In Egypt with the year 728 there began to reign the twenty-fifth, or Ethiopian, dynasty. The Ethiopians had really governed Egypt since about 775, when Piankhi made good his suzerainty by conquest. But from 775 to 728 the Ethiopian kings had been content to exercise their supremacy over the land while they suffered the native princes of Egypt to retain their nominal sway. They were content to receive the homage and tribute of these petty princes, leaving to them the internal administration of the country, but watching carefully lest any combination might be formed to threaten their real rule. There were probably numerous attempts to achieve liberty again, but they were successfully put down. At last a native Egyptian prince, called by the Egyptians king, and reigning at Memphis under the name of Bakenrenf, the Bokkhoris of the Greeks, was deposed and killed by Shabaka of Ethiopia, who now took into his own hands the rule over the combined kingdoms of Ethiopia and Egypt. After this change in the dynasty in Egypt there are numerous signs that a great reawakening of the people of the ancient country of the Nile begins. At last they seem to have seen that the progress of Assyria must finally threaten themselves; that it could not stop at the southern limits of Palestine, but must ultimately, and none could say how soon, cross into Egypt. Furthermore, the Egyptians were beginning to long for a restoration of their power over the great

Asiatic provinces as it had been in the golden days of Thotmosis III and Rameses II. The Ethiopian kings in Egypt had a difficult task in ruling as overlords over the princes in the Delta and elsewhere, who had once been free. What could do more to reconcile Egypt to the new order of affairs than a movement against the common foe of all the west or a campaign to recover the long-lost Asiatic provinces?

As we have seen above, it was altogether improbable that Israel would dare single-handed to break faith with the Assyrians, but if there was some hope of aid from the Egyptians, the case was altogether different. The people of Israel could not be expected to know fully the internal affairs of Egypt so as to understand the essential weakness of the country as an ally. They could readily know the greatness of the Egyptian empire, in which Upper and Lower Egypt were combined with the rich and prosperous kingdom of Ethiopia. They might well be acquainted with the glorious history of Egypt, with its great conquests and successful wars in the past. They could hardly, on the other hand, be expected to know of the weakness of the country at present, of the unsettled strife between the Ethiopian emperor and the princes of native blood; of the local jealousies and petty provincial strifes; of official corruption; and of the insolent avarice of the priestly class. Instead of Egypt's being an important and valuable ally it was in reality a very weak one, and a

little later may be shown to be a cause of weakness rather than strength to her Syrian allies. None of these things were apparently known to Hoshea. Induced by some representations made to him, or through the direct holding out of the Egyptian hand, he sent messengers to Sibe,¹ who was probably an underking of Shabaka, and entered into some sort of alliance with him. He now felt strong enough to omit the payment of the annual tribute to Assyria, which he had paid "year upon year." This implies that he had paid it at least two years before it was omitted—that is, in 727 and 726.

Now it has already appeared that Shalmaneser IV was in Syria, or at least an army of his, in the accession year, 727. A natural way of paying the tribute, and a very common one, was to the Assyrian army when it was near at hand. This Hoshea seems to have done in 727, and again in 726. In 725, relying on the help of Egypt, he rebelled and refused the annual payment of tribute. At once Shalmaneser IV invades Samaria with an army to reduce this incipient fire of re-

¹ In the Massoretic text of 2 Kings xvii, 4, the ally of Hoshea is called So (שׁוֹ), but the word ought probably be punctuated Sewe (שׁוּאֵ). In the inscriptions of Sargon he is called Shabi, and was formerly identified with Shabaka (so Oppert and Rawlinson). Stade was the first to suggest that he was one of the Delta kings, and Winckler (*Untersuchungen*, pp. 92–94, 106–108) produced strong arguments in its favor. He has, however, latterly changed his mind and considers him a general of the north Arabian land of Musri (*Mittheilungen der Vorderas. Gesell.*, 1898, i, p. 5). The argument seems to me insufficient. Winckler's suggestions concerning Musri are exceedingly fruitful, and many are undoubtedly correct, but he has carried the matter too far in attempting to eliminate Egypt almost entirely and supplant it with Musri.

bellion, which, uncontrolled, might involve the whole of his valuable Syrian possessions in flames. Hoshea was altogether disappointed in his expectation of help from Egypt and was left to meet his fate alone. The reserve of the biblical sources has told us nothing of the efforts of Hoshea against the forces of the Assyrians. From the order of the narrative we are probably justified in the inference that he left his capital with an army to meet the advance of the forces of Shalmaneser. He was, however, overwhelmed, captured, and probably taken to Assyria. Shalmaneser had now an open way to the city of Samaria, which he had determined to destroy as the penalty for its rebellion. The execution of this plan was not so easy as the conquest and capture of the king. Samaria prepared for a siege. There is something heroic in the very thought. It was surrounded and hemmed in by territory over which it had once ruled in undisputed sway, but which had long been controlled by Assyrian governors and filled with Assyrian colonists. As Shalmaneser advanced closer he would, of course, destroy and lay waste everything about the city which might have furnished any aid or comfort to it. From the villages and towns thus destroyed the people would flock into the capital until it was crowded. The people of Samaria may have hoped for help from Egypt, watching with sick hearts for signs of an approaching army of succor. They knew what surrender meant in the loss of their city, and in

probable deportation to strange lands. They were fighting to the bitter end for homes and for life. So they resisted—and the story is amazing—for three long years.¹ The king of Assyria died, and still Samaria held out, and would not surrender. It makes one think what might have been if there had been such courage in Israel in the days of Menahem. Shalmaneser IV died in 722 and left Samaria unconquered, and hence all Syria in jeopardy to his successor. If a weak man should take his place now, all that had been won by Tiglathpileser III might be lost.

We have no further knowledge of any events in the reign of Shalmaneser IV. It is true that Josephus² has preserved an account of an expedition of his against Tyre, which he had taken from Menander. According to his story a certain Elulæus, king of Tyre, had rebelled, and Shalmaneser came to besiege the city. He was, however, unable to reduce it after a five years' siege. We have no allusion to any such siege in any of the inscription material which we possess, and it is altogether probable that Josephus has made a mistake and ascribed to Shalmaneser a siege of Tyre which was really made by Sennacherib. If he had really besieged Tyre and left this siege also as an inheritance to his successor, we should almost certainly find it mentioned in the abundant historical material of the next reign.

¹ Kings xviii, 9, 10.

² Josephus, ix, 14, 2. Comp. Winckler, *Geschichte*, p. 333, note 51.

It is impossible properly to estimate the character or deeds of Shalmaneser from the scanty historical materials which we possess. His reign of only five years was entirely too short for any great undertakings. He undoubtedly left to his successor more problems than he had solved himself.

CHAPTER VII.

THE REIGN OF SARGON II.

SHALMANESER IV died in the month of Tebet, and in the very same month Sargon II (721–705 B. C.)¹ became king of Assyria. Like Tiglath-pileser III, he was not of royal blood. In no single passage does he ever claim descent from any of the previous kings, nor in any way allude to his parentage. His son, Sennacherib, who succeeded him, is also silent concerning the origin of Sargon, but his grandson, Esarhaddon, provides him with an artificial genealogy which carries back his line to Bel-bani, an ancient king of Asshur. It is a striking fact that he was able to put himself so quickly and so securely on the throne, and it makes one think that there may have been some understanding before the death of Shalmaneser by which Sargon was made the legal heir. On the other hand, he may have been a successful general, as we have already supposed that Tiglath-pileser III was, and so had in his hand a weapon ready to enforce his ambitious claims to the throne. Like Tiglath-pileser, also, he must have been well known as a man of force, for there was no upris-

¹ The death of Shalmaneser IV took place in 722, which became Sargon's accession year; but the Assyrians counted 721 as the first year of his reign, full years only being counted.

ing against him, and he was at once recognized as the lawful king.

He inherited a kingdom full of great problems and difficulties. Samaria was not yet taken, and if it should succeed in effectual resistance, all Syria would take new heart, and the whole fabric which Tiglathpileser III had laboriously built up, but had not had time fully to cement together, would be in fragments. This was a not improbable outcome, for Egypt was eager to foment disturbance in the southern part of the land, hoping thereby to gain back some of the territory which had been lost. On the north there was also a disturbing center. Tiglathpileser had not been able to finish the partition of Urartu, and that state would be very willing to incite the northern Syro-Phoenician states to rebel when rulers were changed in Assyria, in the hope of building up again the kingdom which Tiglathpileser had broken in pieces. In Babylonia also the death of Shalmaneser had given opportunity for a sudden outbreak of new efforts among the Chaldeans. It was indeed a troublesome age on which Sargon had lighted. A man of great energy and ability would alone be able to meet the dangers and solve them. Such a man was Sargon. Like Tiglathpileser III, he was a usurper. It is an eloquent witness to the resources of Assyria that two such men were produced so close to each other, and not of a royal house, with inherited strength and ability.

We are well supplied with inscriptions¹ setting forth the chief events of Sargon's reign, and have only to follow the plain indications of the Annals in order to see them all in proper sequence.

In the year of the accession of Sargon (722 B. C.) Samaria fell, but it is improbable that he had anything to do with it in person. He could scarcely have been present so quickly, leaving behind him all the possible dangers to the throne which he had just ascended. It was a most fortunate result for his reign that Samaria was taken

¹ The following are the chief inscriptions of Sargon's reign: (a) The *Annals*, published first by Botta, *Le Monument de Ninive*, plates 63–92, 105–120, 155–160, and with corrections and amendments by Winckler, *Die Keilschrifttexte Sargon's*, ii. They are translated into English by Jules Oppert, *Records of the Past*, First Series, viii, pp. 21–56, but this version is now somewhat antiquated. There is a good German translation by Winckler, *op. cit.*, i, pp. 2–95. The Annals have come down to us in four recensions, in a fragmentary condition, and the relations between the recension and between parts of the fragments are sometimes obscure. For details Winckler must be consulted, but allusions to some of the problems will be found below. (b) *General Inscription* (*Inscription des Fastes, Prunkinschrift*), published by Botta, *op. cit.*, plates 93–104, 121–154, 181, and by Winckler, *op. cit.*, ii, plates 30–36, and translated by him, *ibid.*, i, pp. 96–135, and into English by Oppert, "The Great Inscription in the Palace of Khorsabad," in the *Records of the Past*, First Series, iv, pp. 1–20. (c) *The Inscriptions on the Gateway Pavement*, published by Botta, *op. cit.*, plates 1–21, and by Winckler, *op. cit.*, ii, plates 36–40, and translated by him, i, pp. 136–163. (d) *Inscription on the Back of the Slabs*, published by Botta, *op. cit.*, plates 184, ff., and by Winckler, *op. cit.*, ii, plate 40, and translated by him, i, pp. 164–167. (e) *Nimroud Inscription*, published by Layard, *Inscriptions in the Cuneiform Character*, plates 33, 34, and translated by Winckler, *op. cit.*, i, pp. 168–173, and by Peiser, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, ii, pp. 34–39. (f) *The Stele Inscription*, published III R. 11, and translated (in part) by Winckler, *op. cit.*, pp. 174–185. (g) *Bull Inscription*, published by Botta, *op. cit.*, plates 22–62, and by Lyon, *Keilschrifttexte Sargon's*, plates 13–19, and translated by him, pp. 40–47. (h) *Cylinder Inscription*, published I R. 36, and by Lyon, *op. cit.*, plates 1–12, and translated by him, pp. 30–39.

without a longer siege. Very probably the same army which had invested the city secured also its surrender. Neither the army nor the inhabitants of Samaria are likely to have known anything of the change of rulers in Assyria. The biblical account does not mention the name of the king of Assyria into whose hands the city fell, but the form of statement seems to imply that Shalmaneser was still considered king.¹ Sargon was not yet known in the west as he would later come to be. As soon as Samaria was taken he gave orders that the colonizing plans which Tiglath-pileser III had devised and perfected should be carried out on a large scale. From the city there were taken away twenty-seven thousand two hundred and ninety men, who were settled in the Median mountains and in the province of Gozan (Guzanu) along the rivers Balikh and Khabur. To supply their places colonists were brought from Kutha, in Babylonia, and recently conquered territories. The people carried away from Samaria were probably of the very best blood in the land —the men who had fought for three weary years against the most powerful military state of western Asia. They were probably officials, skilled laborers, and tradespeople. The loss to the land was irreparable, and the kingdom of Israel never regained the

¹ "In the ninth year of Hoshea the king of Assyria took Samaria, and carried Israel away into Assyria" (2 Kings xvii, 6). It is to be noted that in verses 4 and 5 the same phrase, "king of Assyria," is used, applying there to Shalmaneser IV, and no hint is given that a change of rulers had taken place. Comp. Guthe, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, p. 193.

strength it had lost. There was another little spasm of rebellion in a short time, as we shall see, but the land had not left in it the national life to sustain another such struggle. So did the Assyrians in the reign of Sargon finish the task which they began in the reign of Shalmaneser II.¹ Over the land of Samaria Sargon set Assyrian governors, and the once glorious and powerful kingdom of Israel became an insignificant Assyrian province.

There were greater problems in Babylonia for Sargon than the west had yet offered. We have seen² how in 729 Merodach-baladan, of the tribe of Bit-Yakin, king of the Sea Lands, had paid homage to Tiglathpileser III and made costly gifts in token of his subjection. That was well enough when Tiglathpileser III was threatening to destroy the entire land, but Merodach-baladan intended only to maintain his allegiance to Assyria so long as the Assyrians were able to compel it. During the short reign of Shalmaneser no effort seems to have been made by the Chaldeans, but it is quite probable that all the while the preparations were going on. When Shalmaneser died, and Sargon was busy in Assyria and unable to proceed to Babylon to take the hands of Marduk, Merodach-baladan judged that the hour had come. Without great difficulty he took southern Babylonia, the ancient kingdom of Sumer and Accad, and then

¹ See above, p. 75, ff.

² See above, p. 135.

the city of Babylon itself. On New Year's Day, 721, he was proclaimed king of Babylon.¹ Here was opened again the same old question as to the ruler in Babylon. Sargon never could lose the great southern kingdom without a bitter war. Merodach-baladan had thrown down the gage, and there was no alternative but to take it up. Sargon entered Babylonia and was met at Dur-ilu by an army under the command of Merodach-baladan, with Khumbanigash of Elam as an ally. According to the usual custom, Sargon claimed a victory.² It is, however, perfectly clear from the issue that Sargon had not been successful. He left Merodach-baladan in absolute possession of Babylon, not attempting at all to enter the country farther, but contenting himself with the possession of the extreme northern portion, which joined with the land of Assyria. On the other hand, Merodach-baladan did not attempt to drive the Assyrians out of this northern part, but was quite satisfied to be left in possession of the city of Babylon, in which there were wealth and power enough to satisfy his ambitions, and difficulties enough with the priesthood to engage his best powers. The failure

¹ Babylonian Chronicle, col. i, line 32. *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, ii, 276, 277. Sargon succeeded to the throne about three months earlier.

² Annals, lines 18-23. These lines are badly broken, and it is difficult to make much of them. In the Cylinder inscription (line 17, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, ii, pp. 40, 41, Sargon thus speaks of himself: "The brave hero who met Khumbanigash of Elam at Durilu and accomplished his defeat." On the other hand, the Babylonian Chronicle (col. i, lines 33, 34, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, ii, pp. 276, 277) asserts that Khumbanigash was victorious over Sargon.

to retake Babylon was a bad beginning for the reign of Sargon. The Assyrians would have less confidence in his prowess; the Chaldeans would have time and opportunity to strengthen themselves in their hold on Babylon; the men of Urartu and of Syria would learn of it, and would judge that the king of Assyria was not equal to his predecessors. Rebellions all over the empire lie latent in this failure of Sargon.

The first rebellion that confronted Sargon was in the west, where one might have thought that the punishment of Samaria would have deterred others from a new attempt. But the Syrian states had not all been so thoroughly blotted out as Samaria, and there was a nucleus in Hamath around which a conspiracy might crystallize. Hamath, one of the oldest cities in Syria, had never been destroyed or even engrafted into the Assyrian empire. This was due to the constant exercise of a crafty policy. Hamath had joined in rebellions, but always withdrew at the right moment, paid tribute, and played the part of a faithful ally of Assyria. It owed its deliverance in the reign of Tiglathpileser III only to this policy pursued by its king, Eni-el. But this craftiness, while it saved the state for a time, was unpopular, and Eni-el fell a victim to his own prudence, and was removed from the throne by a national party. A usurper named Il-ubidi,¹ or

¹ He is named Ya'ubi'di in the General Inscription, 33 (Winckler, *Die Keilschrifttexte Sargon's I*, pp. 102, 103), and Nimroud, 8 (*Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, ii, pp. 36, 37). He is called Ilubidi in the Annals (line 23, Winckler, *op. cit.*, i, pp. 6, 7).

Ya-ubidi, succeeded him and at once began a new policy. In this he was aided by Hanno (Khanunu) of Gaza, whom we have learned to know before in the reign of Tiglathpileser III. The Egyptians did not give him aid at the time when Gaza might have been saved from the Assyrians, but he was now in better favor in Egypt, and was an ally of Sibe. It is most likely that he was trying in the interests of Egypt to gain a hold over Hamath, and that he did get some direct influence is shown by his title of king of Hamath in one of Sargon's texts—to the Assyrians he evidently appeared as the real ruler of the state. Il-ubidi and Hanno at once formed a new confederation, in which Arpad, Simirra, Damascus, and, most surprising of all, Samaria joined.

It would appear from this that even the loss of so many of her best men and the watchful eye of an Assyrian governor were not able to crush every aspiration for liberty. Judah remained faithful to Assyria, and did not join with the confederates. Il-ubidi made Qarqar his fortress, and placed a large army in the field. This was now no mean opposition which confronted Sargon, and after his practical defeat in Babylonia it was likely to have hopes of successfully opposing him. At the outset he displayed one quality of great importance; he set out promptly for Syria as soon as news of the rebellion reached him, determined to strike the first member of the alliance before the others could unite and come to his support. This

Assyrian promptness had often before cost the Syrian states great losses. It fell out in this case exactly as he had planned. At Qarqar he met Ya-ubidi and his army without any of the allies and gained a complete victory. When this was done he made haste to meet Hanno and Sibe, who were the real leaders of the rebellion. At Rapi-khu (Raphia) the Assyrians met the confederates and completely defeated them.¹ Sibe managed to get off with his life and escaped into Egypt; Hanno was taken prisoner and carried off to Assyria. This made peace in Syria for a time; Sibe was not able to undertake any more disturbances, and the remaining confederates needed time for recuperation. The result of this campaign as affecting Assyria was very important. The prestige of Sargon personally was restored, and he was left free, following the example of Tiglathpileser III, to set right the affairs of his empire in other border countries.

Of all these Urartu was the most dangerous and threatening. Sargon had planned to reach its destruction by slow and steady approaches. He would first restore to Assyria, as tribute-paying states, the communities which surrounded Urartu on the west, south, and east, and then finally strike the all-important blow. His first movement was from the east against the two cities of Shuandakhl and Durdukka, situated in the territory be-

¹ Annals, lines 27–31 (Winckler, *op. cit.* i, pp. 6, 7). Comp. General Inscription, lines 25, 26 (Winckler, *ibid.*, pp. 100, 101).

longing to Iranzu of Man, by Lake Urumiyeh. These renounced their allegiance, and received help from Mit'atti of Zigirtu,¹ whose territory probably immediately joined. Sargon quickly defeated them and destroyed the cities (719 B. C.), but did not attempt any punishment of Mit'atti at this time.² In the same year the three cities, Sukia, Bala, and Abitikna, whose exact location is unknown, though they also adjoined Urartu, were destroyed and their inhabitants transplanted to Syria.³ A similar campaign occupied the year 718, directed against the western rather than the eastern approaches to Urartu. Kiakki of Shinnukhtu, a district of Tabal (Kappadokia), had not paid his tribute. He with many of his followers was transplanted into Assyria, and his land delivered over to Matti of Atun (called Tun⁴ by Tiglathpileser III), who was required to pay a higher annual tribute.⁵

The year 717 was not, perhaps, of so great importance as many another which preceded and which followed it in Assyrian history, but it was a year of great interest in one way at least, as it ended the career of Carchemish. Alone of all the smaller states into which the great Hittite empire

¹ Zigirtu (or Zikirtu) are to be identified with the Sagartians (Herodotus, i, cxxv).

² Annals, lines 32–39 (Winckler, *op. cit.*, pp. 8, 9).

³ Annals, lines 40–41 (Winckler, *op. cit.*, i, pp. 8, 9).

⁴ Tun is probably Tyana, the modern Kiz Hisar, at the northern foot of the Taurus, in southern Kappadokia.

⁵ Annals, lines 42–45 (Winckler, *ibid.*).

had broken up it had maintained a sort of independence, paying only an annual tribute. The king of Carchemish at this time was Pisiris, who is even called king of the land of the Hittites,¹ as though retaining in his person something of the glory of the old empire. If he had continued to pay his annual tribute, he would probably have been permitted to remain in undisturbed possession of his high-sounding title and in the free exercise of his authority over the internal affairs of his kingdom. In an evil hour he incited Mita of Mushkê to join him in a rebellion against the payment of tribute. He was speedily overcome, and at once, with his family and his followers, transported into Assyria. With them Sargon carried away as booty eleven talents of gold, twenty-one hundred talents of silver, and fifty chariots of war. Carchemish was repeopled with Assyrian colonists and became an Assyrian province.² In such an easy manner ended the very last remnant of a once powerful empire, which had defied even Egypt at the zenith of its power.

In the same year the cities Papa and Lallukna, probably located near Urartu, joined in a rebellion, but were overcome and their inhabitants transplanted to Damascus.³ Year after year did Sargon, as we have already seen, continue these

¹ "Shar mat Khatti," Nimroud, line 10, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, ii, pp. 38, 39.

² Annals, lines 46–50 (Winckler, *op. cit.*, i, pp. 10, 11).

³ Annals, lines 50–52 (Winckler, *op. cit.*, i, pp. 10, 11).

colonizations in Syria. He was determined to disturb so thoroughly the national life that there might be no opportunity for any further uprisings. After all this intermixture it becomes less surprising that the Jews who returned from Babylon would not recognize the people of Samaria as their fellows,¹ but looked on them as a strange race, and called them Samaritans, and not Hebrews.

At last, in 716, Sargon felt himself strong enough and the way well enough prepared to make a sharper attack on Urartu, and not merely on the states which surrounded it. He was moved to a more active policy by the threatening doings of the king of Urartu. Sarduris, who had opposed Tiglathpileser III so successfully as regards the actual land of Urartu, was now dead, and in his place ruled Ursas, as the Assyrian inscriptions usually name him,² or Rusas, as he is known to native historiographers. As early as 719 Urartu was intriguing against the small kingdom of Man, of which Iranzu was king, and Sargon had to save to Man two cities which Mit'atti of Zigirtu, a tool of Urartu, had seized. That was a warning to Urartu for a time. But now Iranzu was dead and the usual troubles over the succession in small states of the Orient offered an opportunity to Urartu.

¹Ezra iv, 3; Eccles. i, 25, 26; Luke ix, 52, 53; John iv, 9.

²He is called Rusa in Sargon's Annals, lines 58 and 75 (Winckler, *op. cit.*, pp. 12, 13, 16, 17). This is Rusas I of Chaldia. See Belek and Lehmann, "Ein Neuer Herrscher von Chaldia," *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, ix, 82, ff., 339, ff.

The lawful heir to the throne of Man was Aza, son of the last king, and he finally did get himself seated. But Rusas then stirred up against him the old enemy of his father, Mit'atti of Zigirtu, and also the lands of Misianda and Umildish, the latter of which was ruled by a prince, Bagdatti. To these three allies were added some governors out of Rusas's own territory, and all things were ready for a successful attack on the little kingdom. Aza had given pledges of faithfulness to Assyria, and so deserved support. He was soon overcome and slain, and his land would have been speedily divided among the conspirators, with the lion's share for Rusas, had not Sargon suddenly appeared. Bagdatti of Umildish was captured and slain, as a warning, on the same spot where Aza had been killed. Ullusunu, brother of Aza, was put on the throne and confirmed in possession. In this Sargon had defeated the immediate plans of Rusas, but he was very far from having destroyed his influence. Scarcely was Sargon's back turned when Ullusunu broke his Assyrian vows and transferred his allegiance to Urartu, actually giving up to Rusas twenty-two villages of his domain. We do not know what led to this reversal on the part of Ullusunu, but it is probable that he was forced into the act. Besides this Ullusunu induced As-shur-li' of Karalla and Itti of Allabra, two small territories of western Media, to renounce the suzerainty of Assyria and accept that of Urartu.¹

¹ Annals, lines 58, 59 (Winckler, *op. cit.*, i, pp. 12, 13).

Here was an upturning indeed which might be imitated by other states. Sargon increased his army and returned in haste. Upon his approach Ullusunu fled to the mountains, leaving his capital, Izirtu, to the tender mercies of the enraged Sargon. The capital was soon taken, as well as Zibia and Arma'id, two fortified cities. Izirtu was burned and the others suffered to remain.¹ Ullusunu, probably seeing no way of escape even in mountain fastnesses, returned and sued for pardon. Astonishing as it may seem, this was actually granted, and he was once more installed in his kingdom—which confirms us in the belief that Sargon had come to think that he had not been a free agent in his rebellion, but had been compelled to it by Rusas. On the other hand, the two rebels who had joined with him suffered severely for their faithlessness. Asshur-li' of Karalla was slain, his people deported to Hamath, and his land turned into an Assyrian province. Itti of Allabra and his family were also deported into Hamath, and a new vassal king was set up in his place.² At the same time the district of Nikshamma and the city of Shurgadia, whose governor, Shepa-sharru, had rebelled, were reduced and added to the Assyrian province of Parshua.³ In this year Sargon also invaded western Media and conquered the governor

¹ Annals, lines 60, 61, General Inscription, 41 (Winckler, *op. cit.*, pp. 12, 13, 104, 105).

² Annals, lines 55-57.

³ Annals, line 58.

of Kishesim, whose Assyrian name, Bel-shar-usur, probably points backward to the influence of Tiglathpileser III in this same region. Kishesim was thoroughly changed in every particular. Assyrian worship was introduced, the name of the city changed to Kar-Nabu, and a statue of Sargon set up.¹ A new province was then formed of the districts of Bit-Sagbat, Bit-Khirmani, Bit-Umargi, and of several other cities, and Kar-Nabu was made its capital.² Another city, by the name of Kharkhar, whose governor had been driven out by its populace, was similarly treated. Its name was changed to Kar-Sharrukin (Sargon's-burg), and it was colonized with captives and also made the capital of a newly formed province.³ This sort of campaigning had its influence on the surrounding country. From city to city spread the news of the mighty conqueror and of his sweeping changes, and from different parts of Media no less than twenty-eight native princes came to Kar-Sharrukin with presents to Sargon, hoping to purchase deliverance from like treatment.⁴

This year had been full of various undertakings, but nearly all of them may be said to deal directly or indirectly with Rusas of Urartu, who, even while these easterly undertakings were in progress, was not idle. Defeated in his plan of

¹ Annals, lines 59, 60.

² Annals, line 58.

³ Annals, lines 61-64.

⁴ Annals, line 74 (Winckler, *op. cit.*, i, pp. 16, 17).

securing peacefully from Ullusunu the twenty-two villages which had been granted him, as we have seen, but afterward recovered by Sargon, he took them by force. This brought Sargon back in 715 with an army which quickly recaptured the lost territory, which was then supplied with special Assyrian governors. Daiukku, a subordinate governor of Ullusunu, who had yielded to the solicitations of Rusas, was carried off to Hamath.¹ The suddenness and completeness of this victory induced Yanzu of Nairi to bring his homage to Sargon.² Meanwhile the province of Kharkhar, which was formed but a year before, had rebelled and must be again conquered. It was now increased in size by the addition of territory which had been thoroughly Assyrianized, and the city of Dur-Sharrukin was heavily fortified as an outpost against the land of Media. In this year twenty-two Median princes offered presents to Sargon³ and promised an annual tribute of horses. All these campaigns weakened the influence of Rusas over his allies, and so the way was gradually preparing for his overthrow; but the time had not come this year, for Sargon had disturbances to settle in the west.

Mita of Mushkê had interfered with Quê (Cili-

¹ Annals, lines 74-77.

² Annals, lines 78.

³ Annals, lines 83-89; General Inscription, lines 64-67 (Winekler, *op. cit.*, pp. 18, 19; *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, ii, pp. 60, 61). A comparison of these two passages shows a discrepancy in the figures, the former giving the number of Median princes at twenty-two, the latter thirty-four.

cia), and had taken from it several cities to add to his own dominion, which were readily restored.¹

An expedition into Arabia was also rendered necessary for the collection of tribute. The tribe of Khaiapa, which had paid tribute since the reign of Tiglathpileser III, now refused to do so, and was supported by the tribes of Tamud, Ibadidi, and Marsiani. Of these Khaiapa was probably the most northerly, being settled about Medina, while the others stretched southward below Mecca.² These were all conquered easily and restored to subjection. It'amar of Saba, Pir'u (Pharaoh) of Egypt, who may have been Bokkhoris, and Samsi, the queen of Arabia, whose dominions were in the extreme northern part of the country, all sent gifts.³ This latter part of the year probably was of great value to the king in the revenue which it yielded.

In the next year (714) the campaign against Rusas of Urartu was taken up in earnest. The invasion began from the east, Sargon first appearing in Man, where Ullusunu paid him tribute, while Dalta of Ellipi sent presents all the way from the southeastern borders of Media. From Man Sargon advanced slowly and steadily into the territories of Zigirtu, where Mit'atti was still holding sway. One by one the cities and fortified

¹ Annals, lines 92–94, 100.

² See Glaser, *Skizze der Geschichte und Geographie Arabiens*, ii, 261, 2; and comp. Winckler, *Geschichte*, p. 243.

³ Annals, lines 97–99.

camps were taken until Parda, the capital, fell into Assyrian hands. When this had happened Mit'atti and his entire people moved swiftly in one great emigration out of the country and were seen no more. They had probably come out of the steppes of Russia into this favored district, and now returned to their old home. The army was now ready to attack Rusas, who came on to meet it. In the first engagement he was defeated and fled.¹ Sargon did not pursue at once, but waited to make sure of the land which was now deserted by the people of Urartu. The land of Man was entirely covered in marches, that every sign of disloyalty might be rooted out, and was then given over to Ullusunu. One more land must be ravaged before Rusas could be reached and overcome. This was Muzazir, which Shalmaneser II had attacked in 829 B. C., whose prince, Urzana, had acknowledged the overlordship of Rusas. It was a hard mountain march to reach it, but the city, forsaken by Urzana, was soon taken when once it was gained.² The southern portion of Urartu was then invaded. Cities were burned and dug up and the entire land turned into a howling wilderness, and robbed of every hope of any further autonomy. Rusas looked on, perhaps, from some mountain eyrie and saw the utter collapse of his fortunes. The kingdom which his fathers had

¹ Sargon's historian (Annals, line 109, Winckler, *op. cit.*, i, pp. 22, 23) says of Rusas, "He mounted a mare and fled into his mountains." Flight upon a mare's back made him an object of ridicule.

² Annals, lines, 123-133; General Inscription, lines 72-76.

founded, of whom he was no unworthy follower, was being divided among Assyrian states or added directly to the provinces of the empire. For him there was no further hope, and he sought peace in a self-inflicted death.¹

Rusas left a son who succeeded his father as king of Urartu, or Chaldia, as the country was called by its own people, with the title of Argistis II. He found only a small kingdom left for him to rule, about Lake Van and the upper waters of the Euphrates. Long and sturdily had Urartu withstood the progress of Assyria in war, while it, nevertheless, accepted Assyrian civilization and even adopted the cumbersome Assyrian method of cuneiform writing. The Chaldians had even formed an empire and contested the supremacy of western Asia with the Assyrians. In the days of Assyrian weakness they had grown stronger, until the menace to Sargon was so great that he had to plan cautiously and act decisively during a long series of years for its removal. He had now stripped them of all their southern and western possessions and shut up the king amid his mountain fastnesses, from which he would soon venture out to plunder and raid, but without hope of ever again mastering so large a portion of western Asia. Sargon's slowly maturing plans had effectually removed the greatest barrier to his country's career of conquest, extension, and aggrandizement.

For the next three years Sargon was unable to

¹ Annals, line 139.

carry out any great schemes of conquest, because he was absorbed in smaller undertakings intended to complete the pacification of the north and west. The first of these was in western Media, where the province which had taken the place of the old kingdom of Karalla rose in rebellion, and, having driven out the Assyrian governor, set up as king Amitasshi, a brother of the old king, As-shur-li. The new arrangement lasted but a short time, for Sargon soon ended the rebellion. The vassal kings, Ullusunu of Man, Dalta of Ellipi, and Ninib-aplu-iddin of Allabra, all sent their tribute to the triumphant Sargon.

In the northwest, also, Sargon had a very disagreeable task. The land of Tabal had been conquered by Tiglathpileser III and the king deposed. In his place Tiglathpileser set up a man of humble origin, named Khulle. Bound by ties of gratitude or of necessity, Khulle paid his annual tribute until his death and remained faithful to the Assyrians, who had made him what he was. Sargon trusted him as fully as Tiglathpileser, and even added to his dominion the territory of Bit-Burutash. When he died his son, Ambaridi, or Ambaris,¹ was confirmed by Sargon as king in his stead. So completely was he trusted that Khi-lakki (Cilicia) was further added to his territory and Sargon's own daughter was given him to wife.² In spite of all this he was secretly, and

¹ In Annals, line 168, he is called Ambaridi, but in line 175 Ambaris.

² General Inscription, line 30.

later publicly, faithless to Assyria, and joined the coalition of Rusas and Mita, to whom he gave aid in their various undertakings against Assyria. His day of punishment had now arrived. His land was devastated, colonized, and then made into a new province of the empire,¹ and he, with his followers, was carried off to Assyria.

In the following year (712) a very similar case occurred in the district of Meliddu. While Sargon was busily engaged in war Tarkhunazi of Meliddu conquered Gunzinanu of Kammanu (Comana), one of Sargon's tributaries, and seized his territory. This had been done in reliance upon the help of Urartu. Sargon now overran the land and destroyed the capital, Melid. Tarkhunazi for a time defended himself in a fortress, Tulgarimme, but was taken, and, together with his troops, deported to Assyria.² His territory was then divided. Melid was annexed to Kummukh,³ while the rest of the country was repopulated and formed into a new province.⁴ One more year was required before this northern territory was fully reduced to subjection. In 711 there was an uprising in Gurgum, a small Hittite state. The king, Tarkhulara, was killed by his own son, Muttallu, who thus made himself ruler. Sargon soon appeared with a small body of troops, and carried off Muttallu with his followers to As-

¹ Annals, lines 175-178.

² Annals, lines 183-187; General Inscription, lines 79-81.

³ Annals, lines 194, 195.

⁴ Annals, line 189.

syria. His land was likewise made into a province.

While Sargon was engaged in these petty but annoying wars with small states Egypt was again plotting to gain some kind of foothold in Palestine. Ashdod was now chosen as the starting point for another effort. In this city Sargon had removed the king, Azuri, for failure to pay tribute, and had set up his brother, Akhimiti, in his stead. Under the leadership of a man named Yaman, or Yatnani,¹ who was plainly inspired from Egypt, a rebellion began in which Akhimiti lost his life. By some means Philistia, Moab, Edom, and, most surprising of all, Judah were drawn into this new opposition to Assyria. Hezekiah was now king of Judah, and in this fresh union with Egypt he was flying in the teeth of the advice and warnings of Isaiah, his ablest counselor. Sargon felt the importance of this new uprising, and at once hastened either himself or by deputy, in the person of his Tartan,² to end the rebellion. Ashdod, Gath, and Ashdudimmu were easily occupied by the Assyrians. The other states of Palestine seem to have feared to join in the war when it was on, and Egypt sent no help. The inhabitants of these

¹ The variation Yaman, Yatnani, is the same as that found in the name of the island of Cyprus and the Cypriotes. It is therefore natural to suppose that Yaman here is a race, rather than a personal, name, the leader being a Greek mercenary from Cyprus (so Winckler, *Die Keilschrifttexte Sargon's* i, xxx, note 2). Winckler has, however, since come to think that this man was an Arab, a man from Yemen (*Musri Meluhha, Ma'in*, p. 26, note 1). The former view is preferable.

² Isa. xx, 1.

cities were carried away and other captives settled in their places.¹ This campaign so thoroughly stamped out all opposition in the west that it might for a time safely be left to itself.

If now we look back over Sargon's reign up to this point, we shall see that his only direct gains to Assyrian territory had been in the land of Urartu. To Shalmaneser rather than to him belongs the credit of securing Samaria. Indirectly, however, his gains had been great. He had greatly strengthened the Assyrian control from east to west over a wide circle of country, and had so established the outposts of the empire that he might feel safe from invasion. It must be remembered, however, that he was even yet governing a territory much smaller than that which Tiglathpileser III and Shalmaneser IV had controlled. Babylonia was still in the possession of the Chaldeans, and Sargon was bereft of the rarest and most honored title —king of Babylon. But he was not satisfied with this state of affairs, and had probably planned long and carefully in order to its complete overthrow. Now that his borders were safe on the north and west, and the annual tribute over the great empire was fairly well assured, the time seemed to have arrived for his greatest work.

When Sargon, in 721, after the battle of Dur-ilu, left Merodach-baladan to rule undisturbed in Babylon he took upon himself a great risk. There was a grave possibility that the adroit Chaldean

¹Annals, lines 215–217; General Inscription, 90–110.

might so establish himself in the kingdom that the Assyrians could never hope to dislodge him again. But Sargon builded very wisely in this, for there were more causes for discontent in Babylonia than of satisfaction, and Merodach-baladan was much more likely to ruin his prospects of a peaceable reign than to improve them. His status was peculiar and dangerous. He never could have conquered Babylon in the sole reliance upon his own Chaldean forces, but was compelled to utilize not only Elamite but also Aramaean allies, the latter being the same half-nomad tribes which had been a disturbing factor in former times. So long as he was threatened by Assyrian armies Merodach-baladan was able to hold together these ill-assorted followers; self-preservation against a common enemy who might blot them out one at a time made them cautious. But as soon as all danger from Assyria was withdrawn by Sargon's occupation in other quarters these Elamites and Aramaeans began to clamor for a share in the spoil of Babylonia. They had not ventured all in the service of Merodach-baladan without a well-founded hope of participation in the wealth which the centuries had heaped up. Merodach-baladan was not to be suffered to wear the title of king of Babylon while his followers, who had suffered that he might win it, lay in poverty. It would be impossible to satisfy these men with anything short of a license for free plunder, and this could not be given without the ruining of the land over which

he hoped to rule. Beside this Merodach-baladan could not give ever so little to his Chaldeans and Elamites without raising bitter opposition to his rule among the native Babylonians, and especially among the priesthood—perhaps the wealthiest class in the country.

In these opposing wishes there was abundant material for a flame of civil war which would destroy the ambitions of the new king of Babylon, and for this Sargon had left the land free. Merodach-baladan probably desired earnestly to strengthen his position in Babylonia with the natives by a reign of order and peace, leaving them in undisturbed possession of their estates. This was, however, impossible, and he ventured on a career of plunder. Property holders were removed from Sippar, Nippur, Babylon, and Borsippa into Chaldea, where they were held in some kind of bondage, while their lands and other wealth were handed over to colonists out of the number of Merodach-baladan's rapacious and unthinking allies.¹ This policy satisfied neither party to the compact, and Merodach-baladan found himself surrounded on every side by enemies when he sadly needed friends. The Babylonians were always a fickle folk at best, and apparently delighted in changes of dynasty. A restless spirit was ascribed to them, centuries after, in the Mohammedan period, and their history as we have followed it to this point seems clearly to show that

¹ Annals, lines 359–364, Winckler, *op. cit.*, i, pp. 58–61.

they were of this temper now.¹ Nevertheless, they valued highly their ancient institutions and held in high esteem the honor of their royal titles. The priesthood must always be a conservative force in any community, and the Babylonian priesthood in charge of the worship of Marduk, and so invested with the power of making kings, who must take hold of the hands of the god, maintained with enthusiasm the ancient customs. At this time they found less of sympathy among the Chaldeans, Aramaeans and Elamites than among the Assyrians. Tiglathpileser III had so greatly valued the priests and the honors which they had to bestow that he twice visited Babylon in order to take the hands of the god and be proclaimed king, and Shalmaneser IV had even more than followed his example. Sargon might well be expected to have similar ideas and hopes. To him, therefore, the Babylonian priesthood and all the other wealthy classes which had lost home or possessions looked as a possible deliverer from the barbarous Chaldeans and Elamites.

Sargon was therefore doubly prepared for an attack on Merodach-baladan. He had made his own empire so strong and safe that he might leave it without fear, and he was certain of a friendly reception from the Babylonians. His plan was first to conquer the allies of Merodach-baladan and then to strike the defenseless Chaldean himself. An army was sent southward to overcome the

¹ Winckler, *Die Keilschrifttexte Sargon's*, i, p. xxxii.

Aramæans living along the Elamite and Babylonian borders. These were speedily conquered. The Gambuli and the Aramaean tribes of Ru'a, Khindaru, Yatburu, and Puqudu were organized into a new Assyrian province, with Dur-Nabu, formerly known as Dur-Atkhara, one of Merodach-baladan's fortresses, as capital.¹ This successful movement cut off Merodach-baladan from his former allies in Elam. When the Assyrians crossed the Euphrates and captured the small Babylonian state of Bit-Dakkuri, Merodach-baladan did not venture upon a fight, but fled into Yatburu, whence he could communicate with the king of Elam. But Shutur-nakhundi,² who now ruled in Elam in the room of Khumbanigash, was not eager to help Merodach-baladan, and, though he prudently accepted the gifts which had been sent to him, offered no help of any kind.³ The Aramaeans could not help him while an Assyrian army held them in helpless subjection, and the Elamites would not. Merodach-baladan was powerless with his small army to meet Sargon's seasoned veterans. He therefore fled southward into his old homeland and fortified himself in Iqbi-Bel, where he spent the winter, which had now begun.⁴ The Babylonians, relieved of their oppressor, hailed Sargon as a deliverer. They organized a religious

¹ Annals, lines 264–271 and 271–277.

² So the Assyrians write the name, which in Elmaite is Shutruk-nak-huntha.

³ Annals, lines 289–294.

⁴ Annals, lines 294–296.

and civil procession which went to Dur-Ladinna to escort the saviour of the country to Babylon. Sargon entered the ancient city, and in all things conducted himself as a legitimate king of Babylon. He offered the required sacrifices;¹ he restored the canal of Borsippa, which had fallen down;² and by these two acts satisfied the priesthood and helped the country's commerce.

Sargon was now able to have himself proclaimed king of Babylon, and might take the god's hands and fulfill the required ceremonies on New Year's Day of the year 709. If he did this, however, he would have to repeat it year by year, and that might be in the highest degree inconvenient, if not impossible. He could not hold the priesthood faithful to himself if he did not perform the annual ceremonies, and though he could doubtless compel their obedience without winning their hearts it would be dangerous and inexpedient. He was too wise to transfer the capital of his reunited empire to Babylon, and he therefore adopted an expedient which satisfied both parties—the Assyrians and the Babylonians. He adopted the title of "*shakkanak*"—that is, governor, or viceroy—instead of king of Babylon, and for this he would not be compelled to renew the ceremony year by year. In the month of Nisan, at the great feast of Bel, he took the hands of Bel and Nabu and was proclaimed *shakkanak* of Babylon. In all

¹ Annals, lines 299–300.

² Annals, lines 302–304.

respects he had as much power and influence as though he were called king.¹

In the next month Sargon began his campaign against Merodach-baladan. The unfortunate Chaldean had withdrawn in the early spring or late winter from Iqbi-Bel to his old city of Bit-Yakin, where he employed his time in the preparation of extensive fortifications against Sargon, whose invasion he must have been continually expecting. He opened a canal from the Euphrates and filled the country about the city with water, breaking down all the bridges, so that no approach to the city was possible. Sargon found a way to overcome this difficulty, though he does not enlighten us as to his method. The city, once attacked, soon fell, and Merodach-baladan, who had been wounded in the first assault, made good his escape to Elam. An army from the Puqudu and the Sutê, who were coming to help Merodach-baladan, was then overcome and the city of Bit-Yakin first plundered and then destroyed.² In the city Sargon found the rich men of Babylonia who had been deprived of their property in order that Merodach-baladan might reward the men who had made him king. They were sent back to their homes and their property restored. Furthermore, the priesthood received a rich reward for their share in Sargon's triumphs by the return of gods whom Merodach-baladan had taken away and the restoration of the elabo-

¹ Winckler, *Geschichte*, p. 127.

² Annals, lines 347-359.

rate temple worship in Ur, Uruk, Eridu, Larsa, and other places of less moment, while the tithes to the temples were newly revised and imposed upon the people. The land of Bit-Yakin was placed beyond any opportunities, it would seem, for further rebellion, by the deportation of a portion of its inhabitants to Kummukh, from which came captives to take their place. The land was then turned into an Assyrian province to be governed from Babylon and Gambuli.¹ Awed by such proceedings, King Uperi, of the island of Dil-mun, in the Persian Gulf, sent gifts.

By this campaign, as much by the peaceful operations which attended it as by the success of arms, Babylonia was completely pacified, and was now ruled easily by the Assyrians for several years. Sargon had completely restored the old order of things against great odds, and with extreme difficulty.

While Sargon was engaged thus in Babylonia his representatives were hardly less successful elsewhere. In the far west the governor of the Assyrian province of Que, imitating his royal master, Sargon, invaded the kingdom of Mushkê. The people of Mushkê were among the traditional enemies of Assyria. They had been opposed to Tiglathpileser I, and they had a large share in stirring up opposition in Syria to later Assyrian kings. For a long time the Assyrians had not suffered any interference at their hands. Their do-

¹ Annals, lines 366, 367, 369.

minions were bounded now on the south and east by the Taurus and Anti-Taurus, and their ruler was Mita. The Assyrian governor met with such success in conquest and plunder that Mita was forced to send an embassy to Sargon, who was then on the borders of Elam, to sue for peace.¹ At the same time Sargon received gifts from seven kings of Cyprus, though what they may have feared does not appear.² Years after (708 B. C.) Sargon acknowledged their gifts with a present of a black marble stele engraved with his portrait.

At this same period also there was a new spasm of vigor in the almost defunct empire of Urartu. Argistis was now king over what remained of the once powerful empire, and determined to make an effort to regain some of the lost possessions. He induced Muttallu, prince of Kummukh, to join in a confederation. Before anything could be accomplished the news was brought that Bit-Yakin had fallen and an Assyrian army was already on its way to the north. Muttallu was so discomfited by this news that he sought safety in flight. His family and all his treasures fell into the hands of the Assyrians, and his land was henceforth organized and administered as a province. This fall of Kummukh happened at just the right time to enable the interchange of inhabitants with Bit-Yakin, which was mentioned above.³

¹ Annals, lines 371–373; General Inscription, lines 150–153.

² Annals, lines 383–388; General Inscription, lines 145, 146; Stele, col. ii.

³ Annals, lines 392–401; General Inscription, lines 113–117. See page 176, above.

In 708 we reach the last campaign of which Sargon has left his own account. Dalta, prince of Ellipi, who had acknowledged the supremacy of Assyria, was dead, and there was a strife about the succession between his sons, Nibe and Ishpabara. The former appealed to Elam for help, which he received, and by which he was able to drive out Ishpabara. The latter then, on his part, appealed to Sargon, who was the lawful over-lord of the country. Sargon at once responded by sending an army which conquered Nibe and his Elamite allies, captured his capital city, Marubishti, and took him prisoner to Assyria. The land was then set once more in order, with Ishpabara as king.¹

After this year all knowledge of Sargon's reign is lost to us. It is altogether improbable that he undertook any more great campaigns, but rather devoted himself afterward to such efforts to quell incipient rebellion as filled the last year which we have just described. He had indeed reached to the full the warlike ambitions of his life. He had reunited Babylonia to the empire and brought it into complete subjection, so that it was as easily ruled as Assyria itself. He had ended the Hittite empire, a great plague spot in his predecessor's maps. He had crushed the empire of Urartu, or Chaldia, and so rendered safe his own northern border. He had brought into safe subjection all

¹ Annals, lines 402–413, Winckler, *op. cit.*, i, pp. 68–71; General Inscription, lines 117, 121, *ibid.*, pp. 118–121.

the troublesome Syrian states. There were indeed no other undertakings which he might reasonably hope to accomplish which it would be wise to begin.

The works of peace in Sargon's reign were as brilliant as his campaigns had been. He was not content merely with the repairing of palaces and temples, or even with their rebuilding, as were most of the Assyrian kings who were before him. He undertook the colossal task of founding a new city which should bear his own name, Dur-Sharrukin (Sargon's-burg). Here he erected a vast palace, which must have occupied years in the building. Its walls were covered on the inside with magnificent inscriptions recounting the great deeds of his reign. These were so admirable in their execution as to give us a strong impression of the artistic skill of the age which Sargon had made a conquering age. In 707 the palace was finished and the city ready for the entrance of the gods who were to transform it from a vast and beautiful pile of bricks into a real place of residence. Up to this time the king had resided in Calah. In 706 he entered his new city, but his enjoyment of its magnificence was very brief. A broken fragment of an Eponym List gives us some hints of events in the days immediately preceding his death, but they are too badly preserved to allow us to be in any way clear as to their meaning.¹ Sargon died

¹ II R. 69, d.

in the year 705, but whether by the hand of an assassin or by natural death remains uncertain.¹

In the magnificence of his building operations he probably excelled all the kings who preceded him. Certainly no ruins of a former age yet found approach the magnificence of the great palaces which he built in the city which bore his name. In all other works he is naturally brought into comparison and contrast with Tiglathpileser III. Like him, he was great in the planning and organization of great campaigns, and probably excelled in the patience and slow moving on the outworks and allies of an enemy's country before making the final attack. He was also greater in the successful carrying out of great battles and sieges. For there is nothing in the campaigns of Tiglathpileser which equals the taking of Bit-Yakin. As an administrator over the destinies of diverse peoples he is in every way worthy of his predecessor. In the carrying out of the plan of colonization and deportation he far exceeded the limits which marked the labors of Tiglathpileser. But it must be said that in originality of idea and of plan he was far behind Tiglathpileser. It was he and not Sargon who invented this method of dealing with turbulent populations. Sargon was only building on the foundations laid by another; and it is easy to show in many cases that he is the imitator and not the originator. Nevertheless, there should be no diminishing of his fame as a

¹ II R. 69, d. 10. See Winckler, *Keilschrifttexte Sargon's*, i, p. xlvi.

conqueror and king. If Tiglathpileser had planned the empire, now become the greatest power in the world, it was Sargon who had built much of it and rebuilt nearly all the rest. Again had a usurper surpassed the greatest deeds of a legitimate king, and made his name immortal in his country's annals.

2

CHAPTER VIII.

THE REIGN OF SENNACHERIB.

IN the same month in which Sargon died, and on the twelfth day of the month (Ab), Sennacherib¹ (704–682) ascended the throne. He was the son of Sargon, who had so well governed his land and so thoroughly settled his power and control over it that no attempt was made to disturb the order of succession from father to son. But, though he succeeded to the inheritance of the great empire without trouble, there were tremendous difficulties to be settled at once.

The priesthood of Babylonia and in general the Babylonian people were waiting to see what position he would take up with reference to the proud

¹ The principal authorities for the reign of Sennacherib are: (a) The Taylor Prism (usually called Cylinder), published I R. i, 37–42, and also Abel-Winckler, *Keilschrifttexte*, pp. 17–21. It has been translated into German by Hörning, *Das Sechsseitige Prisma des Sanherib in transscribirem Grundtext und Uebersetzung*, and by Bezold, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, ii, pp. 80, ff., and into English by Rogers, *Records of the Past*, New Series, vi, pp. 83–101. (b) The Bellino Cylinder, British Museum, K. 1680, a kind of duplicate of the former, published by Layard, *Inscriptions in the Cuneiform Character*, plates 63, 64. Portions of it are translated into German by Bezold (see above) and into English by Fox Talbot, *Records of the Past*, First Series, i, pp. 23–32. (c) The Bavian Stele, published III R. 14, translated into French by Pognon, *L’Inscription de Bavian, Texte, traduction et commentaire philologique*, Paris, 1879–80, and into English by Pinches, *Records of the Past*, First Series, ix, pp. 21–28. (d) The Neby Yunus Inscription, published I R. 43, and partially translated by Bezold, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, ii, pp. 118, 119.

and ancient people who felt themselves to be the better, even though they were the weaker, portion of the empire. Had Sennacherib gone at once to Babylonia and taken the hands of the god, he might have been proclaimed *shakkanak* of Babylon, as Sargon had been, and it is altogether probable that he would have had no important difficulties with Babylonia. He saw clearly, however, the dangers of a dual capital and the impossibility of mutually pleasing two great peoples so diverse in all their ideas and aims. So long as Babylonia remained a great city, and its citizens nourished their national life and kept burning their national pride, there would always be arising opportunities for vexation against Assyria, and therefore possibilities for some shrewd Babylonian or Chaldean to gain leadership over the popular clamor and seize the throne. The maintenance of a dual kingdom was essentially an anomaly. If colonization and deportation accomplished so much in the north and the west for continuity and peace, why should just the opposite plan be continued in Babylonia? Tiglathpileser, Shalmaneser, and Sargon had done nothing to diminish the national feeling in Babylonia, but rather had contributed fuel to the flame. Tiglathpileser's visits to Babylon in order that he might be proclaimed king had fostered Babylonian pride, in that they made the Assyrian king a suitor for honors at the hands of the priesthood, though he had in reality won his triumph by force of arms. Shalmaneser had done

exactly the same thing. Sargon had done even worse, for he had accepted the lesser title of *shakkanak* in order that he might be delivered from the onerous annual visit to Babylon and be free to come and go as he pleased. Sennacherib would do none of these things. He was a loyal Assyrian and no Babylonian, and was determined to break with all this past history, in which his own country had the power, but gave up its semblance and its show. He would possess that also, and show the world that Assyria was not merely the head of the empire, but its absolute master. He would, in other words, treat Babylonia as a subject state and pay no attention to its royal ideas, its kingly titles, and its priestly authorities. It is possible that in this decision jealousy was mixed up with ambition. Sennacherib could not have looked the empire over without learning that Assyria was still a raw and uncouth country, leaning upon Babylonia for every sign of culture. Perhaps he felt that this position of Babylon itself might make it some day the capital of the entire empire, while Assyria lost its leadership altogether. His policy must prevent any such possibility as that.

Sennacherib must have formed his plans and matured his policy even before his father was dead, for it seems to come into play at once. The first sign of it was purely negative, but it was carefully noted in Babylonia, and the record of the divergent views has come down to us. Sennacherib did not go to Babylon to be crowned or

proclaimed king or *shakkanak*. As we now see the case from the vantage point of later history this was a fatal blunder. The empire divided in opinion at once. The so-called Babylonian Chronicle, resting on official sources, sets down for 704 and 703 Sennacherib as king of Babylon. That is to say, Sennacherib, without the carrying out of the usual rites, without the ordinary concessions to the time-honored regulations of the priesthood, without any salve for Babylonian pride, called himself king of Babylon, and the state record, compiled by authority, sets him down as king. But the Ptolemaic Canon, which clearly goes back to Babylonian sources, marks the years 704 and 703 as "*kingless*."¹ This was the real Babylonian opinion. This man Sennacherib might collect his taxes and tributes because he had the armed forces wherewith to enforce his demands, but he could not force the hearts of the people to acknowledge him as the genuine, the legitimate, king. In this, the first stroke of a new and revolutionary policy, Sennacherib had made provision for a disturbance which should vex his life, if, indeed, it did not disrupt his kingdom—such force have ancient custom and solemn religious rites.

This state of affairs could not continue long—an Assyrian king claiming to be king in Babylon while the Babylonians denied that he was king at all. A rebellion broke out in Babylonia, and a

¹ See above, vol. i, p. 334.

man of humble origin, called in the King List¹ son of a slave, by name Marduk-zakir-shumu, was proclaimed king. Here was again a disturbance brought on by folly, and likely to grow worse before it was better. In this condition of affairs the ever-watchful and certainly able Merodach-baladan saw his opportunity. Marduk-zakir-shumu had reigned one month when the Chaldean appeared, and was able to have himself again set up as king (702). He now set out to bring about a condition of affairs which would compel Sennacherib to leave him alone in the enjoyment of the old honor and position. It was Sargon who had so long left him in peace, while he was occupied in pacifying the west. If he could now disturb the west again and divert from himself Sennacherib and his armies, he might again be permitted to rule long enough to fix himself firmly in his position. This time he might hope to have less difficulty in satisfying his Elamite and Chaldean followers. The plan was adroit, and promised well. The Book of Kings² narrates that Merodach-baladan sent an

¹ See Pinches, "The Babylonian Kings of the Second Period," *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, vi, col. iv, line 13.

² 2 Kings xx, 12-19. There has been some doubt as to the time when this embassy was sent. It has been assigned to the first reign of Merodach-baladan under Sargon (so Lenormant, Hommel, *Geschichte*, p. 704; Winckler, *Die Keilschrifttexte Sargon's*, i, p. xxxi, note 2), and also to his second reign (so Schrader, *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament*, ii, 28, 29; E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Alterthums*, i, p. 466; Winckler, *Geschichte*, p. 129; Mürdter-Delitzsch, *Geschichte*, 2d ed., p. 197; Maspero, *The Passing of the Empires*, p. 275. The latter view seems to me to fit the Assyrian situation better.

embassy to Hezekiah to congratulate him on his recovery from a severe illness. Hezekiah showed his visitors the royal treasures and arsenals, doubtless greatly impressing them with the wealth and strength of Judah. There is no hint of any ulterior purpose in the mind of Merodach-baladan, but the result shows pretty clearly that this embassy was really intended to sow seeds of rebellion. It is most probable that he also sought to draw Egypt into some rebellious compact, for Sennacherib later had also to fight that country. The plan to divert Sennacherib to the west failed because the state of affairs in the kingdom was very different from that which had obtained in the days of Sargon. Sargon was a usurper, and had to make sure of his borders and establish himself upon the throne. On the other hand, Sennacherib inherited a kingdom which accepted his rule without a murmur, and was therefore better able to look after Merodach-baladan at once. He made no false step in the quelling of this rebellion, though his own folly had been the real cause of it. He determined to leave the Palestinian states to their own pleasure and strike at the root of the disaffection in Babylonia.

Sennacherib crossed the Tigris and marched in the direction of Babylon, meeting with little opposition until he reached Kish, about nine miles east of Babylon, where Merodach-baladan had deployed his forces. Here was fought the first battle, and Merodach-baladan was completely routed and

forced to seek safety in flight.¹ The city of Babylon was not prepared for a siege, and Sennacherib entered it without difficulty. The palace of Merodach-baladan was plundered of everything valuable, but apparently Sennacherib did not disturb the possessions of the native Babylonians. He then marched into Chaldea, ransacking the whole country. In one of his records of this campaign Sennacherib declares that he destroyed eighty-nine cities and eight hundred and twenty villages;² in another he gives seventy-six cities and four hundred and twenty villages.³ Whatever the correct figures may be there can be no doubt that the land was fearfully punished. Merodach-baladan, who had hidden himself in Guzuman, was not captured. When this was done Sennacherib set about the governmental reorganization of the country. He had with him a young man named Belibni, a Babylonian by birth, but reared in the royal palace of Assyria. Him Sennacherib made king in this year (702), after Merodach-baladan had reigned but nine months.⁴ When Sennacherib was ready to return to Assyria he carried back immense booty with him, and besides the horses and asses and camels and sheep he took away two hundred and eight thousand people.⁵ This exten-

¹ Taylor Prism, col. i, lines 19–23, Rogers, *Records of the Past*, New Series, vi, p. 84.

² K. 1644. See Bezold, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, ii, p. 84.

³ Taylor Prism, i, lines 34, 35.

⁴ Alexander Polyhistor says *six* months.

⁵ The Taylor Cylinder, Annals of Sennacherib, i, 19–62 (I R. 37). Comp. translation by Rogers, *Records of the Past*, New Series, vi, pp. 83, ff.

sive deportation must have been made, according to the policy of Tiglathpileser, to achieve peace and prevent further rebellion. How well even this heroic treatment succeeded with a high-strung people like the Babylonians only later history can show.

After the end of the Babylonian campaign Sennacherib marched into the territory of the Kasshu and Yasubigallu, who lived in the Median mountains east of Babylonia. They were a semi-barbaric people, and the campaign must have been undertaken merely to make the Assyrian border country safe from their plundering raids. The invasion was successful in reducing the country, and captives of war were settled in it, while the nomadic inhabitants were forced to settle down in the cities. In this country some of the Babylonians whom Sennacherib had carried off may have found their home. Thence into Ellipi Sennacherib continued his march. Ishpabara, whom Sargon had made king, had not paid his tribute regularly, and must now be punished. Fearing the consequences of his faithlessness, Ishpabara fled, and Sennacherib easily captured the capital, Marubishti, with the villages in its environs. A part of the country was colonized and then annexed to the province of Kharkhar, as Ellipi had been to that of Arrapkha. After the withdrawal of the Assyrians, Ishpabara appears to have regained some of his lost territory.¹

¹ Taylor Prism, i, 63 to ii, 33, Rogers, *op. cit.*, vi, pp. 86-88.

In 701 Sennacherib was forced to invade the west. He gives us no new reasons for this invasion, but the occasion for it is easily read between the lines of his records, and deduced from the biblical narrative. When rebellions were afoot in Babylonia, and for a time at least were successful, when Egypt was eager to regain lost prestige in a land where she had once been all-powerful, when an embassy from the indefatigable Merodach-baladan had come all the way from Babylonia to win sympathy and the help of a diversion in the west, it was hardly possible that these small states should remain quiet and pay their annual tribute without a murmur. We do not know how much inclined Hezekiah of Judah may have been to join in an open rebellion at this time. He had, however, taken up a position which would make it easy for him to do so; and the war party with its national enthusiasm and unthinking patriotism was strong at his court. This policy was bitterly opposed by Isaiah, the leader of the cautious-minded men, who saw only disaster in any breach with Assyria at this time. Isaiah was no lover of Assyria, but he saw clearly how weak and poor was the help which the land might hope for from the outside. The Syrian states had suffered much from their former reliance on Egypt, and there was certainly no reason to hope that matters would be any better now. The wisest counsel was undoubtedly that of Isaiah. But, even though Hezekiah was willing to take it, which he certainly

was not, it would have been almost impossible for him to do so. The whole land was aflame with patriotism, and woe betide the man, even a king, who dared to oppose it.

Indeed the king had himself done much to foster not only this very spirit, now become dangerous, but also to quicken a consciousness of security which could not fail to collapse in the presence of such armies as Assyria was able to put into the field. Hezekiah had been victorious over the Philistines,¹ and that probably very early in his reign; why should he not also conquer the Assyrians? would be the simple reasoning of those who had not directly experienced the Assyrian advance in war. He had built an aqueduct by which an abundant supply of flowing water was brought within the city walls. What that meant for the city is almost incalculable by occidentals. Jerusalem had never had flowing water before within its walls. It could therefore easily be taken by a siege in the dry season. Hezekiah had supplied this primary need, and by so doing had immeasurably added to the defensibility of the city. There is no doubt that this was a war measure, and that it would be so understood and interpreted by the people is even more clear.² How easy was the task of the anti-Assyrian party with such arguments as these—victory over the Philistines, and a new aqueduct—to

¹ 2 Kings xviii, 8.

² 2 Kings xx, 20. Comp. 2 Chron. xxxii, 5.

break down the opposition led by Isaiah and supported by his unpopular associates. All that Isaiah actually accomplished was the postponement of the breach with Assyria; without him it would inevitably have come sooner.

As in Judah, so also in Egypt was the way preparing for an uprising in Syria. An Ethiopian dynasty was now ruling, nominally at least, over the whole land of Egypt. But there is evidence enough to show that the Ethiopian king could hardly claim to be absolute master of the destinies of the Nile valley. Sennacherib in his narrative of the later campaign refers not to the king of Egypt, but to the kings of Egypt, and his successors upon the Assyrian throne supply us with lists of the names of kings over districts of Egypt. All these district kings were striving for more power, and the Ethiopian overlord must gain ascendency over them all before he could dispose, as he would, of Egypt's greatness. He could readily see that a movement outside of Egypt, against external foes, would be certain, if successful, to increase his prestige at home. The same hopes would be in the minds of the district kings. A policy like this pursued by a district king, such, for example, as Sibe, might make him, instead of the Ethiopian overlord, the real king of Egypt. If one of these kings was seeking a place in which to gain advantage by interference, there was none more promising than Syria. Even a slight hope of regaining it would readily unite all

parties in Egypt, and he would be sure of his throne. He would thus be glad to encourage any patriotic party in Syria to appeal to him for help, hoping, when the accounts were reckoned up, to be able to turn to his own advantage whatever help he might give to the rebels against Assyria. Gladly would he listen to an appeal for help from Judah. And in spite of Isaiah the appeal was sent. An embassy from Hezekiah, naturally laden with presents, went to Egypt¹ and the Egyptians promised assistance. More and more the patriotic party in Judah gained the ascendancy. The country was ready for a daring stroke against Assyria. Hezekiah became the moving spirit of a rebellion which swept over all the Syrian states.²

The rebellion broke first in Ekron. Here the Assyrian had set up a governor who remained faithful to his masters beyond the Euphrates, to the bitter end. The uprising in his city was general if not universal. “The governors, chiefs, and

¹ See Isa. xxx, 1–4, and xxxi, 1.

² Our authorities for Sennacherib's campaign in the west are the following: 1. Assyrian. (a) I R. 7, No. viii, I. Rogers, *Records of the Past*, New Series, vi, p. 83. Sennacherib's bas-relief, representing his victory at Lachish. (b) The Taylor Prism, col. ii, line 34–col. iii, line 41. Rogers, *op. cit.*, pp. 88–91. 2. Hebrew. (a) 2 Kings xviii, 13–xix, 37. (b) Isa. xxxvi, 1–xxxvii, 37. The passage in Isaiah is the same as that in Kings, with the single great exception that it does not contain 2 Kings xviii, 14–16—a positive proof that this passage is not original in its present setting. Stade has shown (*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1886, pp. 172, ff.) that it consists of three narratives, the first of which is 2 Kings xviii, 13, 17–37, xix, 1–9a; the second, 2 Kings xviii, 14–16; and the third, 2 Kings xix, 9b–37. (See also Benzinger and Kittel on the passage.) This analysis is now generally accepted.

people of Ekron," as Sennacherib says,¹ cast Padi into iron chains and then delivered him up to Hezekiah² to be shut up in prison. This act in itself—and our knowledge of it comes at first-hand from Sennacherib's own historiographers, and not from the Hebrews—shows that Hezekiah was regarded as the real head of the insurrection. Sennacherib could not brook such an insult as this to a prince whom the Assyrians had set up, for nothing of Assyrian prestige could be saved if this were allowed to go unpunished. He resolved to proceed at once in person at the head of his armies and strike suddenly before the forces of all Syria could unite. His first point of attack was the Phoenician cities. Sennacherib says nothing about a siege of Tyre at this time, for he was certainly not prepared to attack a city which could only be reached successfully by the sea. He was, however, able to ravage its tributary cities on the mainland, and so affect it indirectly. Having thus injured the city's commerce and frightened its defenders, Sennacherib turned against Sidon. Elulæus (Luli), who was now king, dared not await the conqueror's approach, and fled. The city surrendered at once, and Sennacherib made it the capital of a new province. Tyre had been engaged in setting up a new confederation of which it should be the head. Sennacherib could now fore-

¹ Taylor Prism, ii, 69, Rogers, *op. cit.*, vi, p. 89.

² Hezekiah, having conquered Philistia, was now regarded as a sort of overlord, and hence was asked to receive Padi.

stall this by setting up Ethobal as king in Sidon and giving him Sidon, Bit-Zitti, Sarepta (Sariptu), Machalliba, Ushu, Ekdippa (Akzibu), and Akko (now Acre) as his kingdom.

The very presence of the Assyrian monarch, engaged in his work of making and unmaking kingdoms, filled all Syria with terror. States which had been ready enough to rebel against Assyrian tribute were now ready to surrender without the faintest attempt at a fight. Among these who had more discretion than valor were Menahem (Minchimmu) of Samsimuruna, the location of which is unknown;¹ Abdili'ti of Arvad, Urumilki of Byblos,² Mitinti of Ashdod, Budilu of Beth-Ammon, Kammusu-nadab of Moab, and Malik-rammu of Edom.³ All these brought heavy and costly presents, and so assured Sennacherib of their desire to live peaceably and pay well their tribute. This formidable defection from the ranks of the rebels greatly reduced their chances for success, for it left large spaces of territory from which neither supplies nor men could be drawn. Sennacherib, however, had not yet terrorized all Syria, and there were some who boldly held on their course and prepared for defense. Of these states Ashkelon first demanded severe treatment from Sennacherib. Tiglathpileser had set up Rukihti as king over the people of Ash-

¹ It is certainly not Samaria, as was once thought by Talbot, Norris, and George Smith.

² *Gu-ub-la-ai*, that is, "of Gebal," the ancient name of Byblos.

³ Taylor Prism, ii, 34-57, Rogers, *op. cit.*, vi, pp. 88, 89.

kelon, but his son, Sharru-ludari, had been driven out and a usurper named Zidqa was now ruling in the city. His only hope of a continuance in power was in successful resistance to Sennacherib. The city was, however, soon taken, and Zidqa with all his family was carried off to Assyria, and Sharru-ludari set up as king. It is somewhat surprising that this conquest did not bring about more desertions from the rebels, but the remainder held fast and had to be reduced piecemeal. Even the other cities which formed part of the little kingdom of Ashkelon had to be taken one at a time; so fell Beth-Dagon, Joppa, Benebarqa,¹ and Azuru.

The campaign was now swiftly approaching Ekron, and Sennacherib is probably reporting only the actual fact when he says that the people of Ekron feared in their hearts.² Before he had his reckoning with them he must first meet a formidable foe. Unlike former kings of Egypt, or of its separate districts, the present rulers were determined to send some help to the newly gained allies in Palestine, or Syria. They might well do so, for it was not merely the possession of Syria which was now in the balance, but even the autonomy of Egypt itself. No man could possibly tell when the Assyrians would invade the land of the Pharaohs if Syria were wholly theirs, and hence a safe base of operations and supplies. As we have said before, there is every good reason for believ-

¹ Beni-berak, Josh. xix, 45.

² Taylor Prism, ii, 73.

ing that this had long ago been contemplated in Assyria. The forces of the Egyptians, advancing northward, united with a contingent from Melukh-kha, probably not very large, and then proceeded onward, intending doubtless a junction with the troops of Hezekiah. Before this could be effected Sennacherib halted the advance at Altaku¹ and offered battle. It was a battle of giants, and, though Sennacherib boasts of the usual victory, it must have been achieved with great loss. That the victory in a measure was his there can be no doubt. He captured the son of an Egyptian king and the son of a general of Melukhkhha. The cities of Eltekeh and Timnath were then taken, and the road was opened to Ekron. Ekron could offer no effectual resistance, and the city was terribly punished. The chief men who had driven Padi from the throne were impaled on stakes about the city, while their unhappy followers were deported. The Assyrian party in the city was, on the other hand, peacefully treated.² It was a horrible object lesson to those who looked on. Padi, who was still in the hands of Hezekiah, was later restored to the command of the city.

At first thought it seems remarkable that Sennacherib did not follow up this victory over the Egyptians. Their allies in Palestine were defeated; their detachments from Arabia were routed; they

¹ Eltekeh, Josh. xix, 44. The exact location is doubtful. See G. A. Smith, *Hist. Geog. of Holy Land*, p. 236.

² Taylor Prism, iii, 1-7.

themselves were in full flight. Much indeed might have been gained by a decisive castigation of troublesome Egypt. But Sennacherib's chief enemy in all this campaign was Hezekiah, and Jerusalem his real goal.¹ Until the Judæan king was ruined and Jerusalem devastated, as Ekron had been, the object of the campaign would not be fulfilled.

Into Jerusalem came the news of the Egyptian defeat at Eltekeh and of the overwhelming of Ekron, and still Hezekiah did not offer to surrender. Up from the plains of Philistia came the victorious Assyrian army, and one by one the fortified cities of Judah fell before it until forty-six had been taken. Their inhabitants were now reckoned as Assyrian subjects, and according to the historians of Sennacherib they numbered two hundred thousand one hundred and fifty.² These cities were then divided between Mitinti, king of Ashdod, Padi, king of Ekron, and Zil-Bal,

¹ "Aber wenn nun . . . Schrader behauptet, die Bedrohung Jerusalems bedeute nur eine nebensächliche Episode im Verlaufe des ganzen Heerzuges, so glaube ich, dass ganz abgesehen von den biblischen Erzählungen man doch zu dem Urtheil wird kommen müssen, der Zug gegen Jerusalem sei Endziel und Schluss des Ganzen. Denn die so ganz besonders starke Bestrafung Hizkias, die Verwüstung von 46 Städten, Abtrennung grosser Gebietsteile, die Aufzählung der sehr grossen Beute, welche uns hier in langer Reihe vorgeführt wird, führen zu dem Schluss, dass Sanherib den Hizkia als besonders gefährlichen Gegner angesehen und bestraft hat."—Meinholt, *Die Jesajaerzählungen*, Göttingen, 1898, p. 96.

² Taylor Prism, col. iii, line 17. These inhabitants were not carried away into captivity. They were marched out (*ushesa*) from their cities and compelled to give allegiance to Assyria. The usual Assyrian expression (*ashlul*) for taking away into captivity is not used here. See Meyer, *Die Entstehung des Judenthums*, Halle, 1896, pp. 108, 109.

king of Gaza—a serious loss of territory to Hezekiah. Thoroughly convinced now that further resistance would mean utter destruction, Hezekiah determined to submit and secure such terms as he could. He sent an embassy to Sennacherib, whose headquarters were established at Lachish in the Shephela. Sennacherib demanded a tribute of thirty talents of gold and eight hundred of silver, as the Assyrian accounts represent,¹ or three hundred talents of silver, as the Hebrew narrative² recounts. The securing of such a sum was a grievous task, and it was only accomplished by stripping the temple of ornaments and furnishing. The humiliation of Hezekiah was as complete as his impoverishment. It was also probably at this time that Padi, king of Ekron, was delivered up by Hezekiah, and thereupon resettled in the rule over his city.³ When Sennacherib had secured the gifts he did not rest satisfied, but, feeling sure that he could not be resisted, demanded the surrender of Jerusalem. A part of his army, under the command of a Rabshakeh, a general offi-

¹ Taylor Prism, iii, 34, Rogers, *op. cit.*, p. 91.

² 2 Kings xviii, 14. Brandis (*Münzwesen*, p. 98) has attempted to show that the three hundred Hebrew talents = eight hundred Assyrian, and this is now generally accepted.

³ The surrender of Padi to the Assyrians is mentioned in Sennacherib's Annals (Taylor Prism, iii, 8-10) before the treaty with Hezekiah. The reason for this is that Sennacherib is there telling of the punishment of Ekron, and goes on to show how it was to be governed in the future. The narrative does not follow strict chronological order, but this episode is rounded out and then the chronological scheme is again resumed. This is the usual form in Assyrian narrative. See Winckler, *Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen*, p. 31.

cer of some kind, is sent, with a detachment of troops as escort, to express his determination. This brought about a panic in the populace, and the king himself was in a frenzy of fear. Years later Sennacherib might well say of Hezekiah: "I shut him up like a caged bird in Jerusalem, his royal city."¹ The city was not besieged, but was blockaded, so that all hope of succor from outside was cut off.² Within the walls, amid all the confusion and fear, preparations for a last defense went on vigorously.³ Without them, at the "conduit of the upper pool, which is in the highway of the fuller's field,"⁴ negotiations were carried on between the Rabshakeh on the one side, and on the other Eliakim, palace governor; Shebna, state recorder; and Joah, chancellor.

Though both threatened and cajoled, Hezekiah refused to give up the city, and the Rabshakeh withdrew his force and joined the main body at

¹ Taylor Prism, col. iii, line 20.

² The statement of Sennacherib's Annals (col. iii, lines 21, 22) does not properly bear the construction that he had laid siege to the city in a formal manner. His phrase is: "Intrenchments I fortified against him, (and) whosoever came out of the gates of the city I turned back." This is not the expression used elsewhere for a real investment of the city. It was a blockade, and the implication is that the forces of the Rabshakeh were encamped around the city, but at a distance, which also is supported by the place at which negotiations were carried on, for this must have been between the two forces and not within the Assyrian lines. Comp. 2 Kings xix, 32: "Therefore thus saith the Lord concerning the king of Assyria, He shall not come into this city, nor shoot an arrow there, neither shall he come before it with shield, nor cast a mount against it." See on the passage Kittel, *Handkommentar*, p. 289.

³ Isa. xxii, 9, 10.

⁴ 2 Kings xviii, 17.

Libnah, whither Sennacherib had withdrawn from Lachish, which had succumbed to superior force. It was conceived to be a place of such importance that its conquest is celebrated by Sennacherib in a magnificent wall inscription with pictures in relief.¹

Sennacherib had now to decide upon the course to be pursued in view of Hezekiah's determined persistence. It was clear that Jerusalem could only be taken after a siege, and this was apparently resolved upon, when news reached Libnah that Tirhaqa, king of Ethiopia, was advancing out of Egypt to give aid to Hezekiah.² A letter was dispatched³ at once to Jerusalem demanding the capitulation of the city, and at the same time Sennacherib moved southward to meet Tirhaqa. He probably reached Pelusium,⁴ on the very confines of Egypt, a place famous both before and since that day as a center for the dissemination of the plague,⁵ and there pestilence suddenly fastened

¹ Published I R. 7, No. viii, I (Rogers, *op. cit.*, p. 83). The pictures are reproduced in Ball, *Light from the East*, pp. 191, 193.

² 2 Kings xix, 7, 9.

³ 2 Kings xix, 9-14.

⁴ Pelusium is given as the place of the catastrophe by Herodotus (ii, 141, see further below), and this is supported by Hieronymus (*Commentaria in Isaiam*, lib. xi, cap. xxxvii, *Patrologiae Latinae*, tomus xxiv, pp. 398, 399): "Pugnasse autem Sennacherib regem Assyriorum contra Ægyptios et obsedisse Pelusium jamque extractis aggeribus urbi capienda, venisse Taracham regem Æthiopum in auxilium, et una nocte juxta Jerusalem centum octaginta quinque millia exercitus Assyrii pestilentia corruisse narrat Herodotus, et plenissime Berossus, Chaldaicæ scriptor historiæ, quorum fides de propriis libris petenda est." There appears to be good reason for holding that this statement of Hieronymus comes from Berossos, and is therefore, in origin, independent of Herodotus.

⁵ See G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, pp. 157-159.

upon the Assyrian army. All hopes of invading Egypt must be abandoned, and Sennacherib led homeward only a miserable fragment of an army which had hitherto proved almost invincible. The joy of that hour to all the west may scarcely even be imagined. To the Hebrews it meant nothing less than God's intervention to save the remnant of a kingdom once so glorious.¹ To Tirhaqa it gave some claim to have conquered the Assyrians, and as a victor over Khatte, Arados, and Asshur he is celebrated in one of his own inscriptions.² The tradition of that wonderful deliverance lived on in Egypt, and was told to Herodotus³ by his cicerone in the temple of Ptah, at Memphis. As he reproduces the story, field mice gnawed the thongs of the bows and devoured the quivers of the army of Sennacherib, "king of the Arabians and Assyrians," so that "a priest of Vulcan, called Sethos," readily had a victory over them. As thus narrated the story contains much unhistorical material, though told with fire and force, but it surely has a basis in historic fact, and refers doubtless to the same event as the Hebrew writer has described.⁴

¹ 2 Kings xix, 32-35.

² Mariette, *Karnak*, pl. 45a, pp. 66, 67.

³ Herodotus, ii, 141. See below, Appendix B.

⁴ Winckler (*Alttestamentlichen Untersuchungen*, pp. 27, ff.) has attempted to show that the narrative in 2 Kings xviii, 13-xix, 37, relates not to one but to two campaigns of Sennacherib. According to this view Sennacherib invaded Palestine in 701, and again, after the year 691, when making an expedition against Arabia, he assailed Palestine and Egypt. The view, attractive for several reasons, has convinced Benzinger (*Die Bucher der Könige*, pp. 177, ff.), Guthe (*Geschichte*

Though successful in all the great campaigns down the seacoast from Sidon to Ashkelon and up the slopes of the hill country to within fifteen miles of Jerusalem,¹ Sennacherib had, nevertheless, failed in the main object of his expedition. Jerusalem still stood, and but for pestilence it would have been a smoking ruin, as Ekron. Hezekiah still reigned, and that with increased prestige, and but for pestilence he would be a captive in Nineveh, as was Zidka, king of Ashkelon. Ethiopia was left free to continue its peaceful assimilation of Egypt, and but for the pestilence Assyrian governors would be ruling its fertile valleys as even now they held sway in Ashdod. Sennacherib's failure in the west justified in every particular the foresight and statesmanship of Isaiah, and the echo of the prophet's words would resound when the empty boasts of the defeated king were known only to quiet students. For twenty years longer

des Volkes Israel, p. 204), and Hommel (*Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. Hastings, i, p. 188, col. 2). It is, on the other hand, not accepted by Kittel (*Die Bücher der Könige*, p. 291), Maspero (*The Passing of the Empires*, p. 293), McCurdy (*History, Prophecy, and the Monuments*, ii, pp. 300, ff., 428-431), and Meinhold (*Die Jesajaerzählungen* and *Jesaja und seine Zeit*). The objections to Winckler's rearrangement into two campaigns are, briefly, these: 1. There is no mention anywhere of a second attack on Jerusalem by Sennacherib. 2. The passage 2 Kings xix, 7, has to be rejected without any other reason than to make the passage fit the theory. 3. It involves a complete overturning of the Hebrew traditions, as represented in the book of Kings, and supported by the prophetic passages in the book of Isaiah. See further a most incisive and convincing criticism of this theory of Winckler by Cheyne, *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, pp. 234, 235.

¹ Lachish is the modern Tel-el-Hesy, and Libnah must be sought in the immediate neighborhood. According to Eusebius it belonged at a later time to the district of Eleutheropolis (modern Beit Jibrin).

did Sennacherib possess the power of Assyria, but he never invaded Palestine again.

Sennacherib had left Babylonia in the full enjoyment of peace, but he had also sown thoroughly the seeds of unrest. Bel-ibni, one of his own creatures, was on the throne, but however well disposed he was, there was no hope that he might successfully resist the distemper of the people. Their patriotic love for Babylon, their belief that once a world city meant always a world city, had been grossly trodden under foot by the Assyrian king; their inborn religious feeling had been outraged beyond endurance by a king who paid not the least attention to their solemn rites of coronation. Sennacherib was now deeply embroiled in the western troubles, and the Babylonians thoroughly understood them, for news traveled far and fast in the ancient Orient. The time was, to their mind, auspicious for the reassertion of national ideals. No matter what Bel-ibni may have desired, he was forced by resistless public sentiment into a position hostile to Assyria. Ever ready for any chance at his old enemy, Merodach-baladan of the Sea Lands joined in the rebellion, and the Chaldeans, under a native prince named Marduk-ushezib, also engaged in it. This looked like a promising rebellion, though that the confederates could divide the land between them if there was success might well be doubted.

The new organization of affairs in Babylonia went well for a short period, until the appearance

in 700 of Sennacherib. At once the whole compact fell to pieces. Belibni was captured and sent ignominiously to Assyria, whose training he had dishonored, along with his foolish counselors. Marduk-ushezib fled toward the south, and went into hiding in the marshes at the mouths of the rivers. Merodach-baladan embarked his gods and his people upon ships, and sailing down the Persian Gulf, settled along the eastern shores in the land of Elam, whither Sennacherib did not dare to follow him. There he soon after died. No man like him as an opponent of Assyria had arisen since the days of Ben-Hadad II of Damascus. Adroit enough to surrender always at the right time, ever full of resources when there was the least hope of success, implacable in his hostility, his removal from action was a great boon to Assyria. His name did not die with him, but his descendants, of the same stuff in their persistency, remained to plague a later day in Assyrian history. The land of Bit-Yakin was next ravaged by Sennacherib in the vain attempt to root out the elements of discord and disaffection. On his return northward Sennacherib had his own son, Asshur-nadin-shum, proclaimed in Babylon as king.¹ And so began another attempt at governing this difficult part of the empire.

In the next year (699) military operations were necessary in Cilicia and Kappadokia. The mountainous country of Khilakku, amid the crags of

¹ Taylor Prism, iii, lines 42–65, Rogers, *op. cit.*, pp. 91, 92.

the Taurus, was penetrated and reduced to subjection. Rebellion in the lower parts of Cilicia, in the province created by Sargon, was stamped out by the destruction of the capital. This campaign seems to have made a great impression at the time. Sennacherib boasts of the overcoming of extraordinary obstacles in mountain climbing; and Berossos¹ ascribes to him the erection of the city of Tarsus. By this he can only mean re-building or restoration, for the city is known to have been in existence at least as early as Shalmaneser II. Another campaign, probably little more than a raid, was directed about the same time against Tumur, in the north.

Again were troubles brewing in Babylonia, even while the king's own son maintained his precarious rule. The Chaldeans were not so well led as they had been, but even in exile they ceased not to plot against the nation which had humiliated them. A large number of Chaldeans had left the southlands of Babylonia and settled on the coasts of Elam. Here they were an ever-present menace to the peace of Babylonia. In 694 Sennacherib undertook a campaign for their destruction. It was a campaign extraordinary in conception and execution. He built boats on the Tigris and manned them with Phœnicians and Cyprians, who were better used to ships than the land-loving Assyrians.² The boats were then floated down

¹ Müller-Didot, *Fragm. Hist. Græc.*, ii, p. 504.

² Taylor Prism, iv, line 26.

the Tigris to Upi (Opis), and thence conveyed overland to the Euphrates by camels, where they were again launched and went down to the Persian Gulf. A short sail brought the forces to the colonies which Merodach-baladan had founded, where the cities were destroyed and their inhabitants slain or carried into captivity.¹ Never before had Sennacherib made a direct attack on Elam, and this was not to go by without an effort after revenge. Khallus, the Elamite king, invaded Babylonia and plundered Sippar. Asshur-nadin-shum, who had enough courage to oppose him, was taken captive to Elam,² whence he apparently never returned. The Elamites then crowned in Babylonia a native by the name of Nergal-ushezib. This act again divided the land. The new king held only northern Babylonia, while all the south was in Assyrian hands. Nergal-ushezib attempted to gain control also over the south, and marched to Nippur, which he took in 693.³ Shortly after he met an Assyrian army, and a battle was fought in which he was taken prisoner and carried to Assyria.⁴ In Elam an uprising took place in which Khallus was killed, and the throne came to Kudur-nakhundi.⁵ These reversals of fortune seemed to hand over the land of Babylon again to the As-

¹ *Ibid.*, lines 29–33.

² Babylonian Chronicle, ii, 42, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, ii, pp. 278, 279.

³ Babylonian Chronicle, ii, 42.

⁴ *Ibid.*, iii, 4, 5.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 9. In the Babylonian Chronicle the name is abbreviated into Kudur.

syrians, but the matter was by no means settled. The Assyrians could not hope to hold Babylonia in safety if the Elamites were not so punished for the late invasion that they would never dare the like again. The change in kings gave a favorable opportunity, and Sennacherib invaded the land. He claims to have sacked and burned thirty-four cities and to have seized much treasure. The king was not taken nor his capital city besieged—and this failure Sennacherib ascribes to weather of unusual severity and to great cold.¹ Kudur-nakhundi lived only three months more, and was succeeded by his younger brother, Umman-minanu, whom Sennacherib considered a man without judgment and intelligence.²

While these events were happening in Elam, and Sennacherib was tied down to his efforts there, another Chaldean seized the reins of power in Babylonia. Mushezib-Marduk was made king in Babylon in 692. It is one of the curious changes in history that he was supported by the native Babylonians. It was but a short time since the Babylonian hatred of Chaldeans was so strong that an Assyrian king who was able to drive them from the country was hailed as a deliverer. Now the Babylonians were filled with hatred and dread of the Assyrians, and made common cause with the Chaldeans against them. The Babylonians and Chaldeans then gained as another ally

¹ Taylor Prism, iv, 43-80.

² *Ibid.*, v, line 3, Rogers, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

the Elamites, by giving to Ummān-minānū the treasures of the ancient temple of E-sagīlā as a bribe. Political necessities had surely made strange bedfellows when the Elamites, who so recently had been invaders and plunderers in Babylonia, were now chosen friends to strengthen a Chaldean upon a Babylonian throne. With the Elamites were found as allies peoples of many places which had been organized as Assyrian provinces but a short time before. Among these were Parsua, Ellipi, and the Puqudu, the Gambuli, and, most interesting of all, Samūnū, the son of Merodach-baladan, who had revenge in his heart beyond a doubt, and was glad of an opportunity to meet his father's enemy. The allies came down into Babylonia, and Sennacherib's historiographer waxed eloquent as he thought of that great array. They were "like a great swarm of locusts."¹ "The dust of their feet was like a storm by which the wide heavens are covered with thick clouds."² In 691 Sennacherib met the combined armies at Khalulē.³ The description of the battle as the Annals have preserved it is one of the most thrilling in all Assyrian literature.⁴ Words of blood and fire are heaped one upon the other to set forth the overwhelming might of the great king's opponents and

¹ Taylor Prism, v, 43.

² *Ibid.*, 45–47.

³ Billerbeck (*Geographische Untersuchungen*, p. 11, note 1; *Susa*, p. 90) locates Khalulē on the left bank of the Diyala, perhaps on the site where Hebheb now stands.

⁴ See Haupt, "The Battle of Halulē," *Andover Review*, 1887, pp. 542, ff.

the awful butchery which they suffered. But the very protestations of such complete victory awaken skepticism, which becomes conviction when we survey the conclusion of the whole conflict. Immediately after the battle Sennacherib withdrew to Assyria. He made no attempt to pursue the forces which he is said to have routed, neither did he turn to Babylon to drive the usurper from the throne. If he really did gain the victory,¹ it must have been with tremendous losses which could not be promptly repaired.

In 689 Sennacherib again invaded Babylonia and came up to the city itself. The Babylonians had now no Elamite allies, and the city was soon taken. Thereupon ensued one of the wildest scenes of human folly in all history. The city was treated exactly as the Assyrian kings had been accustomed to treat insignificant villages which had joined in rebellion. It was plundered, its inhabitants driven from their homes or deported, its walls broken down. The torch was then applied, and over the plain rolled the smoke of consuming temples and palaces, the fruit of centuries of high civilization. All that the art of man had up to that time devised of beauty and of glory, of majesty and of massiveness, lay in one great smoldering ruin. Over this the waters of the Euphrates were diverted that the site of antiquity's greatest city might be turned into a pestilential swamp.

¹ The Babylonian Chronicle (col. iii, lines 16–18) claims the victory for Elam.

Marduk, the great god of the city, was carried away and set up in the city of Asshur, that no future settlers might be able to secure the protection of the deity who had raised the city to eminence. Marduk-ushezib was carried a prisoner to Assyria.¹

It was undoubtedly the hope and belief of Sennacherib that he had finally settled the Babylonian question, which had so long burdened him and former kings of Assyria. There would now, in his opinion, be no further trouble about the crowning of kings in Babylon and the taking of the hands of Marduk, for the city was a swamp and Marduk an exile. There would be no more glorification of the city at the expense of Nineveh, which was now, by a process of elimination, assuredly the chief city of western Asia. But in all this Sennacherib reasoned not as a wise man. He had indeed blotted out the city, but the site hallowed by custom and venerated for centuries remained. He had slain or driven into exile its citizens, but in the hearts of the survivors there burned still the old patriotism, the old pride of citizenship in a world city. He had humbled the Babylonians indeed, but what of the Chaldeans who had already produced a Merodach-baladan and might produce another like him, who would seek revenge for the punishment of his race and its allies in Babylonia? From a purely commercial point of

¹ Bavian Inscription, lines 43-50, Bezold, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, ii, pp. 116-119.

view the destruction had been great folly. The plundering of the great city before its burning had undoubtedly produced immense treasure to carry away into Assyria, but there would have been a great annual income of tribute, which was now cut off; and a vast loss by the fire, which blotted out warehouses and extensive stores as well as temples and palaces. This historic crime would later be avenged in full measure. In any estimation of the character of the Assyrian people the destruction of Babylon must be set down by the side of the raids and the murders of Asshurnazirpal. It is a sad episode in human history which gave over to savages in thought and in action the leadership of the Semitic race, and took it away from the Hebrews and Aramaeans and the culture-loving Babylonians.

For eight long and weary years the only record of the Babylonian Chronicle and the Ptolemaic Canon is, "There was no king in Babylon." The babble of many tongues of diverse peoples who had garnered knowledge, carved beautiful statues, experimented in divers forms of government, sang hymns of praise, and uttered plaints of penitence was hushed, and in its place was the great silence of the desert, which a ruthless destroyer had made.

At some time between 688 and 682 Sennacherib again went westward into Arabia. Sargon had there met with extraordinary success. But the results had been very short-lived. The Bedouin

inhabitants were able to pay tribute, and would do so for a time if there was fear of punishment, but they were so continually moving about from place to place with their flocks and herds that it was difficult to follow them and keep them in dread. It was one thing to punish a people who had houses and cities, it was another thing to discipline a people whose black tents of camel's hair were quickly folded and their possessors swept silently away over pathless deserts beneath a blazing and relentless sun. Sennacherib's long absence had blotted out the memory of the past among the Arabians, and they were now rather under Egyptian than Assyrian influence. To restore the Assyrian position was the object of an expedition known to us only by a reference in the inscriptions of Sennacherib's son and successor. Adumu, a sort of settlement, probably the Dumatha of Ptolemy, was taken and the gods carried away to Assyria.¹ More than this could hardly have been accomplished among a population such as this. Though we have no mention of it, it is probable that some booty was secured, and the Assyrian prestige would be increased by the taking away of the gods.

It was the last act of Sennacherib in war. Shortly after his return home, on the twentieth day of the month Tebet, in the year 681, he was murdered in a temple by the hands of his own

¹ Esarhaddon, Prism (A & C), col. ii, 55-58, Abel, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, ii, pp. 130, 131.

sons, [Nergal]-sharezer and Adarmalik.¹ Like many another assassination, west and east, the crime was due to jealousy of another son and desire to secure the succession to the throne. So ended a reign little worthy of the one which had preceded it. Sennacherib's inscriptions indeed boast loudly of great victories, but there seems but little foundation for most of them. He added nothing to what his father had won and held. His hand was a hand of iron and blood, and not of real creative power. No great policy of administration was devised or begun by him. That he was Sargon's son had won him position, that he had brute force in certain measure had held it for him. The empire had been maintained in its integrity, though the fairest portion of it had been changed into ruin and waste in the doing of it.

The only act of peace which may safely be predicated of his reign was the transfer of the capital from Dur-Sharrukin to Nineveh, where a palace was reerected on old foundations, in which the king dwelt. He began to make Nineveh the world's chief city by the erection of this palace, and by the destruction of the greater Babylon the self-imposed task was completed.

¹ 2 Kings xix, 36, 37; Babylonian Chronicle, iii, 34, where only *one* son is mentioned as the assassin.

CHAPTER IX.

THE REIGN OF ESARHADDON.

WE do not know the exact circumstances which led to the assassination of Sennacherib, but we shall not be far astray, in all probability, if we ascribe it to jealousy on the part of his sons. While he yet lived Sennacherib had made his son, Esarhaddon (Asshur-akh-iddin), a sort of regent over Babylonia. He had also by decree made him the legal heir to the throne, though he was almost certainly not the eldest son.

During his residence in Babylonia in these early years of his life Esarhaddon (680–668)¹ was smitten with a great love for the ancient land with all its honored customs. His whole life shows plainly

¹ The chief authorities for the reign of Esarhaddon are the following: (a) *The Cylinder A, B, C*, published I R. 45–47, and III R. 15, 16, and Abel-Winckler, *Keilschrifttexte*, 25, 26, translated into English by R. F. Harper, *Cylinder A of the Esarhaddon Inscriptions*, transliterated and translated, with Textual Notes, from the Original Copy in the British Museum, republished from *Hebraica*, 1887, 1888; and into German by Ludwig Abel and Hugo Winckler, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, ii, pp. 124–151. (b) *The Black Stone*, published I R. 49, 50, and translated into German by Winckler, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, ii, pp. 120–125. (c) *The Stele of Zenjirli*, published by von Luschan, *Ausgrabungen in Sendschirli*, i, pp. 11–29 and plates i–iv, and translated by Schrader, *ibid.*, pp. 29–43. (d) *Prayers to the Sun God*, published and translated into German by J. A. Knudtzon, *Assyrische Gebete an den Sonnen Gott*, i, ii, pp. 72–264. The chief inscriptions are transliterated and translated in Budge, *The History of Esarhaddon*, London, 1880.

how deeply he was influenced by the glory of Babylon's past, and how eager he was to see undone the ruin which his father had wrought. As soon as the news of his father's death reached his ears he caused himself to be proclaimed as *shakkanak* of Babylon. In this he was going back to the goodly example of his grandfather Sargon. Sennacherib had ceased altogether to wear a Babylonian title. Babylonia was to him not a separate land united with his own, but a subject territory inhabited by slaves whom he despised. Esarhaddon did not even take the name of king, which in Babylonian eyes would have been unlawful without taking the hands of Marduk, now exiled to Assyria. Immediately after his proclamation in Babylonia Esarhaddon hastened to Nineveh, where the rebellion collapsed at once, and he was received as the legitimate king. According to the Babylonian Chronicle it had lasted only a month and a half—from the twentieth day of Tebet to the second day of Adar.¹ The biblical story represents the two murderers as fleeing to Armenia, and there is no reason to doubt that this was the case.² Esarhaddon's inscriptions say that he left Nineveh in the month of Shabat; and this was probably in pursuit of his brothers.³ He fought a battle with the rebels and their followers at

¹ Babylonian Chronicle, iii, 36, 37.

² 2 Kings xix, 37.

³ Cylinder, col. i, lines 1–26, Winckler, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, ii, pp. 140–143.

Khanigalbat, near Melid, and readily overcame them.¹ They had probably been hoping for some assistance from Armenia, and now accepted it. The campaign had lasted only eight months, and in the month of Kislev, 680, Esarhaddon was crowned king of Assyria.

It is very difficult to follow closely the order of events in the reign which was now begun. Unlike Sargon or Sennacherib, Esarhaddon has left us scarcely a fragment in which the chronological order of events is followed. He was more concerned in setting forth the deeds themselves than the order and relation of them—such at least must be our judgment unless at some time a text of his in true annalistic style should be found.

In the very first year of his reign (680) Esarhaddon gave clear indications of his reversal of his father's policy.² Babylon had been destroyed; he would rebuild it. No Assyrian king before him had ever set himself so great a task. He did not live to see it brought to the final and glorious consummation which he had planned, but he did see and rejoice in a large part of the work. With much religious solemnity, with the anointing of oil and the pouring out of wine, was the foundation laying begun. From the swamps which Sennacherib had wantonly made slowly began to rise the renewed temple of E-sagila, the temple of the great

¹ *Ibid.*, lines 18–21.

² Meissner and Rost, *Die Bauinschriften Asarhaddon's, Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, iii, pp. 189–362, with plates.

gods, while around it and the newly growing city the king erected from the foundations upward the great walls of Imgur-Bel and Nimmitti-Bel. All these, as the king boasts, were enlarged and beautified beyond that which they had been in their former glory. Slowly through the reign along with the wars which must now be told went on these works of peace and utility, to find their entire completion in the reign of Esarhaddon's like-minded son.

The first work of war to which Esarhaddon must direct his energies was a new castigation of the Chaldeans. While he was busy in securing his throne a fresh outbreak had occurred in the old district of the Sea Lands. Nabu-ziru-kinish-lishir, a son of Merodach-baladan, had gained some of his family's power in Bit-Yakin, and with this as a base of operations had possessed himself of the country as far north as Ur. When Esarhaddon dispatched an army against him he fled to Elam, whither his father before him had more than once gone for refuge. There was now, however, a new régime in Elam, and the king, Ummanaldash II, seized him and slew him. His brother, Na'id Marduk, fled to Assyria and delivered himself up to Esarhaddon, who, with a mercy that honors his heart and his judgment, sent him back to Bit-Yakin to rule the country under Assyrian overlordship.¹ This sudden desertion on the part of

¹ Babylonian Chronicle, iii, 39-42; Cylinders A and C, ii, lines 32-41; Cylinder B, ii, 1-26.

Elam of its traditional friendship for Merodach-bal-adan and the Chaldeans in general is very difficult to understand. Up to this time the Elamites had always aided every movement of the Chaldeans against the Assyrians. There happened also a little later, in 674, another strange manifestation of a new policy among these same Elamites. While Esarhaddon was elsewhere engaged the Elamites surged down into Babylonia, and, murdering and plundering as they went, reached as far as the city of Sippar. The Babylonian Chronicle records this raid,¹ but does not utter a word concerning any retaliation on the part of the Assyrians.

While Esarhaddon was carrying on the rebuilding of Babylon, and the population was returning which had been scattered, he found occasion for a small passage at arms with the Chaldean tribe of Bit-Dakkuri, which had gained sudden wealth through the destruction wrought by Sennacherib. When the Babylonians had been driven away by Sennacherib from the territory about Babylon and Borsippa these Chaldeans had promptly taken possession. As the selfsame people were now returning whom Sennacherib had thus dispossessed, Esarhaddon determined to drive out the settlers. He deposed their king, Shamash-ibni, and set over them Nabu-usallim, a son of a certain Balasu mentioned by Tiglathpileser III.² When they had

¹ Babylonian Chronicle, iv, 9, 10.

² Cylinder A and C, ii, 42-54, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, ii, 128-131; Cylinder B, iii, 19-27.

been dislodged the lands were restored to their former owners. At about the same time Esarhaddon undertook to bring into subjection the tribe of Gambuli, perhaps a mixed race of Aramaeans who were settled in the border country between Elam and Babylonia near the mouth of the Tigris. They had given aid to Ummanaldash in his raid in 674, and must now be humbled. Their prince, Bel-iqisha, did not dare a battle,¹ and so surrendered and gave pledge to hold his fortress, Shapi-Bel, as a sort of outpost against Elamite invasions; it was then strengthened by the Assyrians for this purpose. Esarhaddon was too prudent to attack Elam; and there was shortly less need for it. Ummanaldash II died in the same year, and his successor, Urtaku, was of very different mind as regards the Assyrians. He appears to have used every effort to maintain peace and friendship between the two peoples. As an evidence of this temper of mind stands his action of 673 in sending back to Agade the gods who at some previous time had been carried away by the Elamites.

All these operations of war were child's play compared with the drama in the west, in which Esarhaddon played the chief rôle. We have already seen that Sennacherib had signally failed in Syria. He had been absolutely unable to conquer Tyre, chiefly because it had the sea on the western side, forming a defense which the Assyr-

¹ Cylinder A and C, iii, 53-iv, 7.

ian could not burn nor pull down, and of which he was probably well afraid, as a landsman from the east might well be. His efforts in Judah, we have also seen, ended in a calamity for which his superstition or faith could find only disquieting causes. Furthermore, the only effort at setting up a new government and of making a center for Assyrian influence had no abiding power. He had planned to set up Sidon as a rival of Tyre, and to gather about it in an artificial manner several cities which were better adapted to be rivals than friends. His rearrangement of the city dominion had no element of stability in it, and soon dissolved. Ethobal, whom he had made king, was probably loyal enough, and his personal influence maintained the *status quo*, for it was in the end a personal rather than a national plan. As soon as he was dead and his son, Abd-milkot, reigned in his place the people of Sidon quietly dropped the Assyrian allegiance and went on with their dispatching of ships on the Mediterranean and with the piling up of treasure, none of which was paid over to Assyria as tribute. Here, then, in the Phœnician territory were entirely independent states, Tyre and Sidon, each with its own territory. We are clearly instructed concerning the territory of Sidon, and, though Sennacherib had stripped Tyre of her possessions, there is reason to believe that some of them had been regained. The wealth alone of these two states might well tempt a king who was spending upon new and old building

operations such regal sums. Former kings had secured vast sums for the noninterference with Phoenician commerce; he might certainly hope to gain at least this boon, not to be despised, and he might also really conquer Phoenicia and make a loyal province of it.

With such hopes and dreams Esarhaddon led his first westward campaign. The way had been well prepared by the Assyrian conquerors who had devastated before him, and none would view the onset of his troops with equanimity. Before he could reach the sea a rebellion was genuinely on foot. Abd-milkot had found an ally in Sanduarri, king of Kundu¹ and Sizu,² two cities, the latter located in a mountainous, almost impassable, country in northern Cilicia. Sidon had the protection of the sea, while Kundu and Sizu had the wild and trackless mountains about them. The Assyrians had often before crept among the mountains and attacked enemies hidden like birds among the clefts, as the Assyrian annalist loves to portray them. But their success by sea had been inconsiderable. The new confederation seemed to have elements of strength beyond many which had preceded it. On the approach of the Assyrians the courage of Abd-milkot forsook him and he fled to sea. Esarhaddon besieged Sidon, and the city held out well—we do not know exactly how long—but the campaign against the two

¹ Kundu is Kuinda (Strabo, xiv, v, §10), located on the Gulf of Antioch.

² Sizu is Sis, in the Cilician mountains.

rebels lasted three years. It is certainly highly probable that the greater part of this long period was devoted to the maritime city rather than to the mountain hamlets. When Sidon fell the city was devoted to destruction. The walls which had been a defense for ages were tumbled into the sea; the houses in which wealthy merchants had lived were torn from their foundations and utterly ruined. The whole city was leveled to the plain and blotted out of existence.¹ All this is after the models of ancient days, and shows to what a pitch of wrath Esarhaddon had been wrought by the long and tedious siege. But at once he turns from this custom and exemplifies the other and better side. Upon the same site another city is built and named Kar-Asshur-akh-iddin (Esarhaddon's-burg), that in it the old commerce might live again. The new city thus built was peopled by inhabitants of the mountains conquered in war, and also and more reasonably by others drawn from the coasts of the Persian Gulf. Abd-milkot was captured, perhaps in Cyprus, and beheaded. Kundu and Sizu were also taken, and the unfortunate Sanduarri was treated in the same way.

When Esarhaddon returned from the campaign he brought with him substantial evidences of his victory. Kundu and Sizu had probably enriched him but little, but with Sidon the case was entirely different. Here was a commercial city

¹ Cylinders A and C, col. i, lines 10-54; Cylinder B, col. i, lines 27-30; *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, ii, pp. 124-127, 144, 145.

through which had passed a goodly share of the commerce between east and west. As through Gaza passed the trade of Arabia to the western nations now coveting the luxuries and refinements of the east, so through Sidon, and especially through Tyre, passed all that luxurious Asia had to contribute to the sybarites who lived in Greece and Italy. These things could not pass year by year through Sidon without leaving a share of the choicest of them in the hands of those who trafficked. Esarhaddon enumerates in one bald list the treasure which he carried away. It was of gold, silver, precious stones, ivory, costly woods, tapestries, and dress stuffs. The color and the richness of the east were in this mass of wealth. Esarhaddon had not reckoned too highly upon the gains of his conquest, even if three years had fled away before it was taken. To these were added the cattle, the sheep, and the asses which were driven away to render service hereafter in Assyria. The end of this campaign is a record of return to the most wretched barbarism of Assyria's darkest days. When he came up to his city gates Esarhaddon made a triumphal entry to the sound of loud music. In his train marched his captives, and among them were the chief men of Sidon, and bound round their necks was the ghastly head of Abd-milkot, while the principal men of Kundu and Sizu bore in like manner the head of Sanduarri. It is a strange sight, this entry into Nineveh, when it is remembered that the king

who made it was Esarhaddon, who had been merciful to a son of Merodach-baladan and had restored to the Babylonians the lands which his father had wasted. The natural Assyrian temper had revealed itself in this latest of Assyrian monarchs.

The attack on Tyre probably began while Sidon was still in a state of siege. It was an entirely different problem, and much more difficult. Tyre was better defended by the sea than Sidon. It was larger, richer, more determined. There is little doubt that if the Tyrians had believed that the payment of a heavy gift, or even the promise to give a large annual tribute, would have freed them from all further Assyrian disturbance of trade, they would have gladly met either or both conditions. They had done so before. But there was a determination about Esarhaddon's actions that could hardly be satisfied with anything short of absolute control. The people of Tyre wanted to save some sort of autonomy, in order to the greater freedom of their commerce, and the only hope for this now was to fight and not to pay for it. Esarhaddon began his siege in earnest. He walled in the city entirely upon its landward side, and began a wearisome effort to conquer it by famine. But of one entrance to their city; and that the most important, he could not rob the Tyrians. The sea remained open, and by the sea might readily enter all that Tyre needed for the life of its citizens. He could deprive the city of its com-

merce by land, and that naturally must soon destroy its commerce by sea, but if the Tyrians had the heart to hold out, they certainly could not be starved into submission. Ba'al was now king of Tyre and he was clearly of different stuff from his less courageous predecessors. Year by year the siege dragged on, while other and greater efforts occupied the attention of Esarhaddon, and in the end there was no result. The siege had to be lifted, and Esarhaddon must confess defeat. It is true that upon one of his largest and most impressive monuments he pictures Ba'al of Tyre kneeling before his august majesty, who holds him with a ring through his lips.¹ On the inscription, however, there is not one word about the fall of Tyre, nor elsewhere in any of Esarhaddon's records is there any claim that Tyre had been taken. We are forced to the conclusion that Esarhaddon is here glorying without justification, and that Ba'al of Tyre during his entire reign maintained his independence. The failure to take Tyre was a loss, in that great treasure would undoubtedly have been secured, but in no way was the continued existence of the city a menace to Assyria or an interference with the progress of Assyrian power anywhere in the west. There was no danger of any attack by Tyre upon the Assyrian flank if Esarhaddon should decide to move southward with his forces. Tyre would go on with her com-

¹ The Stele of Zinjirli. See von Luschan, *Ausgrabungen von Sendschirli*. Berlin, 1893.

merce and leave the rest of mankind to fight its own battles.

Esarhaddon had administered a salutary lesson to Sidon and its ally ; he would now press on to discourage any further alliances or confederations in Palestine against himself and his rule. Again and again the oft-recurring rebellions in Palestine had been brought about by Egyptian agents who stirred up the small states and hoped to gain power when Assyria had been driven off. No Assyrian king had hitherto done more than snuff out the little flame of patriotism and punish the offenders. None had been so bold as to execute¹ a move against Egypt herself, prime cause of all the trouble. It is proof of the power of an ancient name that this had not been done, for opportunities there had certainly been in plenty. Egypt had been so weak that she would probably have fallen an easy prey to armies such as Assyria had long had in the field. But the Assyrians had in their thought the Egypt of Thotmosis III and Rameses II, and did not rightly estimate the Egypt of their own day. Esarhaddon, however, had learned otherwise in some way, and now laid careful and wise plans for the overthrow of Egypt. The Assyrians had broken down the great culture-loving race of the Euphrates and had scattered its treasures ; they would now proceed to do in like manner unto

¹ Sennacherib had certainly planned to invade Egypt. See above, pp. 197, 198, and compare, "I have digged and drunk water, and with the sole of my feet will I dry up all the rivers of Egypt" (Isa. xxxvii, 25).

the great people who had conserved literature and art and science during the march of the centuries and had survived the wreck which had come to others less fortunate. The freebooters of Asia, who had sacked and burned and made howling wastes where once had been beautiful cities, must seek a wider field and enter Africa.

In 673 Esarhaddon makes his first attack upon Tirhaqa, the Ethiopian king of Egypt. The campaign was absolutely without tangible results. The Assyrian army, indeed, reached the Egyptian border, but did not cross it. The way was stubbornly contested, and Esarhaddon at length withdrew temporarily without abandoning his designs. In 670 he again moved forward,¹ and probably with greatly increased forces. He was soon over the border upon this campaign, and at the first battle at Iskhupri gained a decisive victory over the Egyptians. Two more battles followed, and in these also was he victorious. After a march of fifteen days from Iskhupri he appeared before the walls of Memphis² and laid siege to an ancient and magnificent city. Memphis was unprepared, and soon fell into his hands. The family of Tirhaqa was taken, but the Pharaoh himself made good his escape into Nubia, paralyzed with fear and hopeless of the very idea of resistance. Memphis was

¹ Esarhaddon had previously consulted the oracle of the sun god and had received a favorable answer. See Knudzon, *Assyrische Gebete u. sw.*, ii, p. 177.

² Stele of Zinjirli, lines 39, 40.

plundered and destroyed. Esarhaddon had tasted the joys of plunder and the satisfaction of revenge at Sidon, and was glad to drink them again to the full. The fall of Memphis filled the whole land with dismay. Such an event had probably never seemed to the proud people a possibility. There were no further resources in the country, the king had fled and left all, and only surrender was possible. As far as the confines of Nubia the country surrendered to the Assyrians. In two brief campaigns, with apparently little loss, an Assyrian army had undone the work of centuries and humbled in the dust the world's proudest people. What was lost to the world in the destruction of Memphis can never be known. How much else of works of art, of historical memorials, of beautiful buildings, perished may only be surmised. Esarhaddon admits that he carried away from the temples fifty-five royal statues. It was a complete overthrow, but the resistance had been slight and brief, and the land was happily not devoted to destruction.

At once Esarhaddon reorganized the government of the country. It was already divided into twenty-two divisions, called nomes. Over each of these a native prince was set up, who was really only a puppet in the hands of the Assyrian officials and assistants by whom he was surrounded. Even the names of the cities were changed into Assyrian forms, so that, for example, Sais became Kar-bel-matati (fortress of the lord of

lands), and Athribis was to be Limir-ishakku-Asshur, though the inhabitants of the country would certainly never adopt such ill-sounding combinations in the room of that to which their ears for many generations had been accustomed.¹ But that many Egyptians quickly acquiesced in the new order of affairs is perfectly plain. Over the twenty-two princes Esarhaddon set Necho of Sais as chief king, subject, of course, to himself as the real overlord. Necho went so far in devotion to his Assyrian masters as even to give his son an Assyrian name. It is no wonder that the heart of Esarhaddon swelled with pride when he contemplated this conquest. That the youngest power in the Orient had been able to conquer and now to administer the affairs of a people who had been famous and powerful centuries before the first Babylonian colonists had settled in Asshur was indeed cause sufficient for boasting.

Though the greatest by far, this conquest of Egypt was not Esarhaddon's only victory in the west besides Sidon. Various Arabian tribes had given trouble to Sargon and to Sennacherib, and Esarhaddon was not free from the same difficulties. Before his first Egyptian campaign in 674 he had been compelled to attack Melukhkha. Melukhkha had indeed no political organization

¹ For details of the campaign see the Stele already referred to, K. 3082 (Winckler, *Untersuchungen zur Altorientalischen Geschichte*, pp. 97-99); Rogers, *Two Texts of Esarhaddon* in *Haverford College Studies* No. 2 (with autograph facsimile of the text); and Bu. 91-2-9, 218 (Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, ii, pp. 21-23).

coterminous with its geographical boundaries. Sennacherib mentions a king of Melukhkha, but he could hardly have reigned over a country so extensive as that which the word covers in the Assyrian inscriptions. Esarhaddon began his raid, for it was little else, from Palestine. The deserts were a sore trial to his troops, unused to any such campaigning, and would have been destruction to them but for the help given by the people of the little kingdom of Aribi. Esarhaddon penetrated into the land as far probably as Mount Shamar. The king of Melukhkha was taken captive, a matter of moment only in this, that he might have become an ally of Egypt. The entire campaign was only undertaken to set the people in dread of Assyria and so make them careful to give no aid or comfort to Assyria's enemies.

In this same connection it is interesting to observe Esarhaddon's treatment of the small land of Aribi, the part of northern Arabia which comes up between Palestine and the Euphrates valley. The Assyrian kings had already had dealings with two queens of this country. Tiglathpileser, Sargon, and Sennacherib had also ravaged in Aribi, and the land had been brought in a considerable measure under the influence of Assyria. Hazael, a king of Aribi, had suffered much from Sennacherib, and had been especially bereaved in the loss of his gods, which had been carried away. Emboldened, perhaps, by the knowledge that Esarhaddon had reversed his father's

policy in Babylonia, he besought the king for the return of his gods. The prayer was granted, and a friendly feeling thus reestablished. And now followed a very strange act. Esarhaddon set up a new queen in Aribi, who appears not to have disturbed the established order at all. Her name was Tabua, and she had been reared at the Assyrian court. How she could have reigned as queen while Hazael continued as king is somewhat difficult of explanation.¹ It appears probable that we have here an instance of a sort of double rule. Perhaps the situation is like that which existed in the Nabathean kingdom at a very much later date. These kings mention their queens in their inscriptions and stamp their heads along with their own upon coins, which would seem to indicate that they exercised some influence in the state.² Hazael died during the reign of Esarhaddon, and was succeeded by his son, variously called Ya'lu and Yata³.

In the reign of Esarhaddon there was felt for the first time in all its keenness the danger of an overflow of the land by great Indo-European immigrations. Long before this time these peoples, living in what is now southern Russia, had begun to spread southward. The Medes formed one great wave of their migration. They had, however,

¹ Maspero (*Passing of the Empires*, p. 358) makes her simply the wife of Hazael, and says nothing of the expression in Cylinder A and C, iii, 14, in which dominion over the country is expressly attributed to her.

² Winckler, *Geschichte*, p. 267.

turned eastward, had settled in the mountains northeast of Assyria, and beyond Elam, and had not disturbed the Assyrian empire. Greater migrations than that of the Medes were now becoming severely threatening. One wave swept down from the northern shores of the Black Sea, and met with the first Asiatic power in Armenia. Armenia was not now the power it once had been, but it was, nevertheless, strong enough to separate the Indo-European horde as by a wedge. One great mass moved westward into Asia Minor. The other and much less formidable went westward and southward into the outlying Assyrian provinces. The name of a leader in this second stream of migration has come down to us in the form of Ishpakai, who is called an Ashguzaean, which may be the same as the biblical Ashkenaz.¹ This man, leading his horde of Indo-European barbarians, came as far as Lake Urumiyeh. Here he found the people of Man,² who had felt the Assyrian power and had paid their annual tribute like their neighbors. They had, however, been entirely undisturbed for a long time, as Sennacherib had not invaded their territory at all during his reign. In the migration of the Indo-Europeans they saw a hope of securing aid by which all allegiance to Assyria might perhaps be thrown off. It was a plan of folly, for the new lords which they would thus secure were not likely to be any better than

¹ Jer. li, 27.² Knudtzon, *Assyrische Gebete*, ii, p. 130.

the old ones whom they put off. Esarhaddon, learning of this alliance, invaded the country and conquered Ishpakai, apparently without much trouble.¹ It was the easy victory of discipline over disorder. Esarhaddon may have satisfied his own mind with the thought that he had removed a great danger, but in reality his victory was of very slight consequence. He had indeed broken down this alliance, but he had not disposed of the hordes of men who formed the migration. Their leaders were ever seeking some new method of harassing his outposts and plundering his tributary states. Some, like Kashtariti, even threatened the very existence of the commonwealth, for he attempted to form a great coalition of the Mannai, the Cimmerians, and the Chaldians. It fell to pieces from mutual jealousies, but not without sending Esarhaddon in dread to consult still further the oracles of the sun god.²

While there were shrewd men like Kashtariti among these immigrants, who needed to be treated with consideration and firmness, the greater mass were like dumb, driven cattle. The Indo-Europeans, indeed, were not an organized body aiming at a definite conquest of Assyrian territory. They were rather hordes of semibarbaric and hungry men pushed from old homes and seeking new ones. Many of them settled in Man, and cared not if they did have to join in the annual payment of an

¹ Cylinders A and C., ii, 27-31; B, col. iii, 16-18.

² Knudtzon, *Assyrische Gebete*, ii, pp. 72-82.

Assyrian tribute. The great bulk of the migration moved on into the Assyrian province of Parsua, which was quietly and irresistibly overflowed and filled with a new population. Then spreading yet farther, they went on into Media. Here was already settled a population of closely related stock who had migrated thither at an earlier day, and had, as we have seen, offered but a feeble resistance to the Assyrian kings who were engaged in plundering raids. They were unable to keep out the newcomers who quietly settled among them. Some of the Median princes appealed to Esarhaddon for aid in keeping out the unwelcome immigrants. The Medes had formed as yet no central government. They had not been genuinely engrafted into the Assyrian empire, and they were unable in any united way to oppose the new migration. If there had been less centralized government in Assyria and no standing army, the very soil of the ancient Assyria would undoubtedly have been overrun. Only the disciplined forces which were ready to oppose them wherever they appeared diverted the barbarians who had passed eastward from Urartu into Media.

Among the Median princes who begged Esarhaddon for help against the engulfing wave were Uppis of Partakka, Sanasana of Partukka, and Ramateya of Urakazabarna.¹ Esarhaddon was probably glad of the invitation to interfere. He had reason to be, for he was threatened in a twofold

¹ Cylinders A and C, iv, 19–37, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, ii, pp. 132–135.

manner by this migration on his eastern borders. In the very beginning he was being deprived of control in provinces from which much tribute had been brought, and without the payment of tribute the standing army which had made Assyria powerful could not be kept up. Assyrian merchants would never pay taxes for its maintenance. He was further in fear lest these new Indo-Europeans engrafted on the old stock might make a new state with a government of its own, central in position, ample in authority, and strong enough to threaten its neighbors no less than to maintain its own integrity. When that came to pass Assyria would have on the east an enemy more dangerous than Chaldia had been on the north. Esarhaddon's campaign to help these Median princes amounted to nothing in its results, and we are, of course, not told how much the army suffered in losses before it was withdrawn.

Another expedition with similar purposes was directed against the country of Patusharra, which Esarhaddon carefully locates between the Bikni mountains (Demavend) and the desert, which must be the salt desert of northern Persia. Here he took prisoners two Medo-Persian princes named Shitir-parna and Eparna.¹ There was no valuable result from this expedition also, or we had had it set forth with much earnestness and enthusiasm by Esarhaddon. That he was alarmed by these easterly migrations is beyond doubt.

¹ Cylinders A and C, iv, 8-18; B, iv, 3-9.

The nomads could not pierce the ancient land nor approach to Nineveh itself; the armies were too strong and the fortified outposts too numerous for that. They were, however, quickly overspreading a rich and valuable country which the Assyrians had tried to conquer, and had partially succeeded in conquering, and had undoubtedly hoped to fit fully into the empire. But the nomads were making this forever impossible. The Assyrians armies might conquer them here and there, but it was only along the edges of the slow-moving current. The great volume pressed behind, and the tide advanced again. Esarhaddon was at last compelled to accept the inevitable, and watched fearfully while the people who had been nomads as it seemed but yesterday were settled in the valleys, engaged in agriculture, and making the first steps toward the organization of a new state. In these days the provinces which had been first overrun and plundered by the Assyrians, and then organized and colonized, were taken from Assyria forever. Herein was enacted the same drama which centuries later took place in Italy, as the northern barbarians came southward over the mountains and seized the plains of Lombardy. Rome could make only a feeble resistance, and a little later even the capital went down before them. The parallel goes even that far also, for Nineveh likewise was done to destruction through the help of these same barbarians who now settled in her outlying provinces.

We have traced from its first diversion in Urartu the eastern branch of the Indo-European migration until its settlement in the northeastern Assyrian provinces and in Media. The western branch was vastly more formidable in numbers and power. While the eastern branch has no distinctive general name applied to the entire body, the western is known under the name of the Cimmerians. From Urartu they went westward, passing through the provinces of Assyria which had formed the kingdom of Urartu. Assyria was undoubtedly fearful of the issue. If the head of the stream should be diverted southward ever so little, it would be pressed by the following masses into Mesopotamia, and no man was farsighted enough to know the result of a situation like that. The end of the Assyrian empire might even now be at hand. Esarhaddon must strike the moving body a blow strong enough to sweep it farther northward and make certain its diversion into the land of Asia Minor, and not into Syria. He did deliver his stroke against the Cimmerians at a place called Khubushna, in northern Cilicia. He boasts that he conquered Teuspa, a Cimmerian, a Manda—that is, a nomad or Scythian.¹ There is very little to be said of the victory, and the probability is that Esarhaddon had not assaulted the main body at all, which was moving rather northwesterly, but only one portion which had turned southward.

¹ Cylinder A and C, ii, 6-9.

However that may be, the chief object of Esarhaddon's concern was achieved. The Cimmerians moved on into Kappadokia, entering Asia Minor rather than Mesopotamia. The little kingdoms of Meshech and Tabal fell before the tide of migration. Assyria lost by it some fine provinces in the northwest, as we have seen that it did in the northeast, through the invasion of the other branch of emigrants. With the exception of these losses Assyria suffered little. It is, however, not to be doubted that no such danger had ever before assailed the Assyrian empire. Esarhaddon had saved it. A weak king at this juncture would have lost all, and Assyria, a barbarism in the robes of civilization, would have been engulfed. It is idle to speculate on the possibilities had such been the end of the invasion. The passing of the headship of the Semitic races from Assyria must have had momentous consequences. The passing of the leadership in western Asia from Semitic to Indo-European hands was clearly impending, but it was now postponed through the energy, the foresight, and ability of Esarhaddon. Even if his name had not been enrolled among the greatest of Assyrian kings by the conquest and annexation of Egypt, he would have deserved the position by the deliverance from the Cimmerians and their eastern fellows in these very threatening days.

The ill arrangement and the fragmentary character of the Esarhaddon texts leave us much in doubt concerning the latest events of his reign.

He took the city of Arzania, in the Syrian desert,¹ in one of his later campaigns, though we do not know just what led to the attack.

In 669 a rebellion of some kind broke out in Assyria. We have no knowledge of its cause or purpose, but it was put down with a strong hand, Esarhaddon promptly causing the death of the chief men concerned in it.² A man of his temperament was not likely to be lenient in such matters.

In 668 he undertook a campaign into Egypt. We are not well informed as to the cause of this, for our knowledge of it rests not on any of Esarhaddon's own inscriptions, but only on the brief mention of the Babylonian Chronicle.³ It is probable that there had already begun in Egypt the situation which demanded the strenuous efforts of Esarhaddon's successor.

Before he set out on this expedition he must have felt some premonitory symptoms which made him doubt the long continuance of his life, for he took steps to provide for his successor. In this he may have been influenced by a desire to spare the people, if possible, such a chapter of difficulties as confronted him in the beginning of his own reign. In the month of Iyyar, 668, at the great festival of Gula, he caused to be published a proclamation commanding all the inhabitants of Assyria, both great and small, from the upper to

¹ Cylinder A and C, i, 55, 56.

² Babylonian Chronicle, iv, 29.

³ *Ibid.*, 30.

the lower sea, to honor and acknowledge his son Asshurbanapal as the crown prince and future king. This was the deed of a wise and prudent man. Unhappily he coupled with it another provision, which was fraught with the most awful consequences, and can only be characterized as an act of folly. In Babylon at the same time he caused his son Shamash-shum-ukin to be proclaimed as king of Babylon. If Asshurbanapal was to rule as king in Assyria, and another brother was to be king in Babylon, no matter what regulations of power or agreements of authority were arranged between them, there was inevitably a reopening of the old difficulty, the old jealousy and strife, between Assyria and Babylonia. Sennacherib had felt this so severely that he had tried to terminate all disputes by the destruction of Babylon. Esar-haddon had undone that wrong by rebuilding the city—a colossal enterprise now nearly finished—and from the very beginning of that great work until this proclamation of Shamash-shum-ukin he had secured peace and at least a measure of contentment in Babylonia. There was now strong reason to hope that by rapid and easy intercourse between the two great sections of the Semitic race all ancient animosities and jealousies might die out and the countries really become one. This could only be brought about by the possession of power in the hands of one king, by centralization, in which, while Assyria held chief place, Babylonia should yet receive the honor due her, because

of her venerable antiquity and her great culture. Instead of a wise provision for the continuance of the order by which Esarhaddon was king of Assyria and *shakkanak* of Babylon—an order that for now twelve long years had produced and maintained peace—Esarhaddon had provided for the return of an old order, often tried and always a failure. Babylonia would get a taste of semi-independence and would at once yearn for something more. The ruler set over her, be he never so faithful to his father and to Assyria, would be forced inevitably into rebellion or lose his head and his throne altogether. In this decision Esarhaddon was following old oriental precedents, which have also often been imitated since his day. He was dividing his kingdom, and there would be shedding of blood ere the reuniting, if, indeed, it were possible ever to achieve it.

The forebodings of Esarhaddon had been well founded. On his way to Egypt he fell sick, and on the tenth day of Marcheshwan, in the year 668, he died.¹

He had had sore trials and great difficulties. He had endured grievous defeats and sustained severe losses, but he had, nevertheless, had a glorious reign. That the provinces which once paid great tribute were lost to the Indo-Europeans upon the northeast and northwest was less his fault than his misfortune. No king could well have done more than he, and it is to the credit of his ability that

¹ Babylonian Chronicle, iv, 31, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, ii, pp. 284, 285.

he did not lose much more, even the whole of Mesopotamia or even Assyria, for no army, however well led, was of permanent value against a moving mass of men with unknowing and unthinking thousands pressing from the rear. These losses were far more than compensated by the gaining of the fertile and beautiful valley of the Nile. With this added, even though much was lost, Esarhaddon left the Assyrian empire larger and greater than it had ever been before. In battle and in siege, in war against the most highly civilized peoples and in war upon barbarians, Esarhaddon had been so successful that he must rank with Sargon and Tiglathpileser III, and must be placed far in advance of his father, Sennacherib. In him, in spite of mercy shown a number of times, there raged a fierceness and a thirst for blood and revenge that remind us forcefully of Asshurnazirpal. His racial inheritance had overcome his personal mildness.

In works of peace no less than in war he was great and successful. In the city of Nineveh he restored and entirely rebuilt a great arsenal and treasure-house which had already been restored by Sennacherib.¹ At Tarbis he began the erection, probably somewhat late in his reign, of a great palace intended for the occupation of his son Asshurbanapal. At Calah he also began an immense palace, which remained unfinished when he died. The excavated ruins reveal a ground plan

¹ Cylinders A and C, iv, 49-59.

of vast extent, and the fragmentary sculptures show that the building was richly decorated and beautified.

All these constructions, though they were numerous enough and great enough to have lent distinction to the reign of almost any of the kings who had reigned before him, were comparatively insignificant by the side of the rebuilding of Babylon. In spite of the inscriptions and the fragments which are devoted to the celebration of this work it is impossible to form any adequate idea of so colossal an undertaking. He saw the city re inhabited and beginning again a glorious career, where, at the beginning of his reign, there had been a swamp and a desert.

The last reign of great achievements in both war and peace was over in Assyria. The morrow would bring change and confusion. A man who had mingled mildness and severity in unusual degree had gone out from among men, and his sons would never be able to exhibit such qualities in union.

CHAPTER X.

THE REIGN OF ASSHURBANAPAL.

WHEN Esarhaddon was dead there was no war of succession and no difficulty about the passing to his son of all his powers and titles. Asshurbanapal, the Sardanapalus of the Greeks and the Latins, and the Asnapper¹ of the Old Testament, became king in Nineveh, and his brother, Shamash-shum-ukin, was likewise everywhere received as king of Babylon. The dual control in the Assyrian empire began with great promise of success, though exposed to the difficulties and dangers already enumerated.

Of this reign we have much historical material.²

¹ Ezra iv, 10, R. V., Osnappar (^{אַשְׁנָפָר}), better Asenappar.

² It is quite impossible to give any useful survey of the inscriptions of this reign. The most important is the splendidly preserved Rassam Prism, containing 1,803 lines of writing on ten sides, published V. R. 1-10 (with numerous variants from other texts). It is translated into German by P. Jensen, *Keilschrift. Bibl.*, ii, 152-237. In addition to the translation of this particular text Jensen has also translated certain parallel and supplemental passages from other inscriptions (*ibid.*, pp. 236-269), in which most of the matter needed for historical purposes is contained. For more complete lists of the inscriptions belonging to the reign the following may be consulted: Bezold, *Kurzgefasster Ueberblick über die Babylonisch-Assyrische Literatur*, pp. 108-121; George Smith, *History of Assurbanipal*, London, 1871; Samuel Alden Smith, *Die Keilschrifttexte Asurbanipal's Königs von Assyrien (678-626 v. chr.) nach dem selbst in London copierten Grundtext, mit Transcription, Uebersetzung, Kommentar und vollständigen Glossar*. Leipzig, 1887-89. There are discussions of some important questions concerning the Asshurbanapal texts in Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, especially i, pp. 244-253, 474-483. In the narrative below references are given to other inscriptions and to detailed investigations concerning them

Asshurbanapal was devoted to the collection of books, and equally interested in their production. He took pains that his deeds and his wars, his buildings and his very thoughts and hopes, should be carefully written down. No inscriptions of any previous reign are so beautifully written as his. None are so smooth in their phrases, so glowing in their pictures, so sweeping in their style. But the care as to form was carried so far as to obscure at times the sense, and one wishes for the bald directness of the older monuments. Furthermore, to our present great discomfiture, the inscriptions are not written in annalistic form, with the events of every year carefully blocked out by themselves. We are therefore often at a loss to determine exactly in what year an important event took place. The events are set forth in campaigns, and as the campaigns are not coterminous with the years, it is impossible accurately to date events. To add to the difficulty the Babylonian Chronicle does not help us any longer with its brief notes of events and their exact location in time.¹ The only dates of his reign which have come down to us beyond all doubt are, first, the very central event of the reign, the result of the inevitable conflict with his brother, and, secondly, the date of his death. We are therefore deprived of any guide to the chronology of the events, and are compelled to view them all as Asshurbanapal has arranged them for

¹ The Babylonian Chronicle ends at the very beginning of Asshurbanapal's reign, with a notice of the campaign in Kirbit, mentioned below.

us, in the form of campaigns. This is the more unsatisfactory, as we have, at least in one instance, clear proof that the order of the campaigns is logical rather than chronological. Asshurbanapal, or rather his historiographer, has grouped them according to a scheme along which they seemed to his mind to develop. That this order was artificial rather than natural is shown by one brief hint in the Babylonian Chronicle concerning an expedition to Kirbit, a district of Elam. From Kirbit plundering hordes of men had been sweeping down into Emutbal, which was the original home land of Eri-Aku before he entered upon rule at Larsa. Emutbal now belonged to Babylonia, and Asshurbanapal must defend it if possible. To discharge this obligation he either led or sent an army against it which soon devastated the land, "dyed the rivers with blood as one dyes wool"—the phrase is Asshurbanapal's—and plundered the country. This expedition, according to the Chronicles,¹ took place in 667, the first full year of Asshurbanapal's reign, and was therefore the first expedition actually begun and ended by him. In his inscriptions,² however, it figures as the fifth and not as the first campaign. It was, however, of little consequence, and the momentous events of the long and brilliant reign begin with the expeditions to Egypt.

¹ Chronicle, iv, 37 (*Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, ii, 284, 285). This date is confirmed by K. 2846 (Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, i, pp. 474, ff.).

² K 2675, Rev. 6-12, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, ii, pp. 174, 175.

Esarhaddon had died on the way to Egypt, and left the necessary expedition as a part of the inheritance to his son. When he made his brilliant campaign in Egypt he had met with but slight resistance; Tirhaqa had not fought at all, but had fled to Nubia. Esarhaddon did not pursue him thither, but reorganized the administration of the country, and left Tirhaqa to rest in his own home land. But Tirhaqa waited but a short time to gain accessions of strength, and then entered Egypt again, which he speedily reconquered. The Assyrian officers, petty princes, and civil servants were unceremoniously driven from the land. Memphis was retaken, and there Tirhaqa set up his court. Egypt was in reality completely torn from Assyrian hands, and the wonderful work of Esarhaddon undone. It was these untoward events which caused the third Egyptian invasion by Esarhaddon, during which he died. All these events are narrated in the inscriptions of Asshurbanapal as though they had taken place in his own reign, and not in the last year of his father's. He has some excuse for this, apart from the desire of further glory for himself. He probably considered himself as the real king from the twelfth day of Iyyar, 668, when he was proclaimed as crown prince.

Asshurbanapal, as soon as he became king, probably ordered the army, which had already set out for Egypt under the leadership of his father, to proceed. Whether he himself actually took the

head or sent it on under command of a Tartan is doubtful. The narrative is, as usual, in the first person, and this does not prove the king's actual presence. Before Egypt was entered Asshurban-apal received gifts and protestations of loyalty from twenty-two princes of the seacoast, who joined forces with him. He had not far to march before the army of Tirhaqa was met at Karbanit, in the eastern or central part of the Delta, where it was defeated. Tirhaqa had remained in Memphis, and as soon as he heard of the defeat fled to Thebes. Memphis was occupied by the Assyrians without opposition, and there were received all the princes, prefects, and officers whom Esarhad-don had set in authority in Egypt, but who had fled from their posts on the return of Tirhaqa. They were all reinstated and the Assyrian rule firmly established. Then, laden with heavy plunder from the richest country of the world, the army returned to Assyria. Whether the leaders of the army were suspicious of the restored princes or not, or whether they had received some hint of a conspiracy, we do not know, but they held themselves in readiness for a recall, and did not proceed directly home.

As soon as the faithless governors thought that the Assyrian forces were withdrawn three of them, Sharludari of Pelusium, Pakruru of Pisept, and Necho of Memphis and Sais, began to plot against the Assyrian overlordship. They sent messengers to Tirhaqa asking him to join with them. The

Assyrian generals were on the watch and caught the bearers of the traitorous dispatches. With this clear evidence in hand Sharludari and Necho were suddenly arrested, and only Pakruru escaped. Three rebellious cities, Sais, Mendes, and Tanis, all in the Delta, were taken, apparently without the striking of a blow. The inhabitants were slain; some were flayed alive and their skins were spread on the city walls, while the bodies of others were impaled upon stakes about the city. So returned again in the literary days of Asshurbanapal the hideous atrocities of the days of Asshurnazirpal. It may well be asked, What had the centuries of progress done for the Assyrian people? Ferocity and thirst for blood were here found in as full measure as ever. The leaders of the rebellion, however, were much better treated. They were carried in chains to Nineveh, where it is hardly likely that they would be tortured to death. Two are mentioned no more, and one was handsomely forgiven. Necho must have been a man of forceful character, in whom Asshurbanapal recognized a servant too valuable to be lost. In spite of his serious breach of faith he was laden with costly and beautiful presents and returned to his rule at Sais, while his son, Nabu-shezib-anni,¹ whose Assyrian name bears witness to his father's devotion to Assyria, was set to rule over the satrapy of Athribis, also in the Delta north of Memphis.

These events began in 668: they were probably

¹ His name had been Psammeticus.

entirely completed in 667, the first official year of the reign of Asshurbanapal. Egypt was once more pacified by force, and there was some hope that this peace might continue. Tirhaqa withdrew again to Nubia. He had long held out against Assyria, and his heart was still hostile. Others might accept Assyrian presents and occupy Assyrian posts, for him there was only a longing for the revenge that never came. Death hurried him away before there was any opportunity for another rebellion against the arch enemy of all the west.¹

When he was gone from the world of action his policy and his hopes, nevertheless, lived on. Shabaka had left a son, Tanut-Amon, whom the Assyrians call Tandamani.² He had now come to man's estate and succeeded to such rights and titles as the unfortunate Tirhaqa, his stepfather, had to leave. With the army of Tirhaqa, and accompanied, undoubtedly, by the good wishes of much of Egypt, he came up from Nubia and seized Thebes. That this was so easily accomplished is only another evidence that the real power of As-

¹ See, for an assembling of the inscription material relating to this Egyptian campaign, Winkler, *Untersuchungen zur Altorientalischen Geschichte*, pp. 101, ff., and especially Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, pp. 478, ff.

² The name was formerly read Urdamani (for example, by Jensen, *Keilschrift. Bibl.*, ii, p. 167), and Urdamani was then identified with Red-Amon or Rud-Amen. The correct reading, Tandamani, and identification with Tanut-Amon (*Tnwt-imn*, Tenotamon) were demonstrated by Steindorff ("Die Keilschriftliche Wiedergabe Ägyptischer Eigennamen," *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, i, 356-359.

syria was concentrated in the Delta and could hardly be said to extend much beyond Memphis. With Thebes as a basis Tandamani advanced northward and gained foothold in On, or Heliopolis. How long he might have held this place in spite of attacks from the Assyrian governors in Egypt is doubtful, but when he learned of the advance of the Assyrian army to relieve the city he abandoned it and fell back to Thebes. The Assyrian army then moved on in pursuit, and of the next event there are two variant accounts. According to one, Tandamani fled from the city on the approach of the army, and was overtaken and beaten at Kipkip.¹ According to the other version, he was conquered at Thebes, which he attempted to hold.²

The campaign was probably short as well as decisive. By it Asshurbanapal had greatly strengthened the Assyrian hold upon Egypt, but he, nevertheless, came far short of making it at all permanent. In fact, the Assyrians could not hope to hold Egypt so long as a spark of national feeling survived. To accomplish so great a feat, one or the other, and perhaps both, of two expedients would be necessary. The first was colonization upon a scale more extensive than had ever yet been attempted. If tens of thousands of native-born Assyrians could have been transported over distances

¹ Rassam Cylinder, ii, 36, 37, Jensen, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, ii, pp. 168, 169.

² K. 2675, Obv. 72, Rev. 5, lines 72-74, Jensen, *ibid.*, footnote No. 1.

so great and so exhausting and settled in the country, these might gradually have permeated it with new ideas of trade and commerce so thoroughly that the old national ideas of culture and religious devotion would have given way to a pursuit of wealth. By this means national feeling, and with it desire for the ancient independence, would have slowly burned out. The second expedient was a great army of occupation well distributed over the whole country, commanded not by native princes, but by Assyrians of undoubted loyalty, but, nevertheless, frequently changed to avoid possible entanglements in local intrigues or incitements to overweening personal ambition. Asshurbanapal appears not to have seriously attempted the former plan. The latter was tried on a small scale, but as soon as the great civil war began, which was even now brewing in Babylonia, the troops had to be withdrawn. Necho remained a faithful vassal to his death, but his son, Psammetichus, who succeeded him, declared himself independent even before the year 660. The taking of Egypt had been the most brilliant event in the reign of Esarhaddon. From it the Assyrians had drawn great treasure, on which the standing army had been partially maintained. In spite of trials so great a king such as Sargon or Esarhaddon would probably have held it, but Asshurbanapal was cast in a different mold. It was the first great loss of his reign; others less startling were to follow. The decline of the Assyrian empire had begun.

From his father Asshurbanapal had also inherited a campaign against Tyre as he had one against Egypt. We have already seen how Esarhaddon had besieged the city on the land side, leaving open the sea approach. The siege was maintained steadily, but was long without result, as it was always possible to introduce abundant provisions from the sea. But slowly the cutting off of the land approach choked the commerce of the sea, and Tyre fell by degrees into dire need. At last Baal deemed it the wiser plan to yield, probably soon after the beginning of Asshurbanapal's reign. The manner of the surrender was characteristic of all the previous history of Tyre. He would buy the favor and pardon of the new king. As a token of his entire submission to Assyrian suzerainty he sent one of his daughters and a number of his nieces to adorn the harem of Asshurbanapal, and his own son, Yahi-melek, to be reared at the court, probably with the idea that he should be thoroughly educated in Assyrian ideas. Asshurbanapal sent the son back, but retained the women and the presents which had been sent with them. The fall of Tyre is described as the third campaign¹ of Asshurbanapal, but the city must have yielded as early as 668, since we find Baal contributing troops to the expedition against Egypt.² At the same time Yakinlu, king of Ar-

¹ Rassam Cylinder, ii, 49–62, Jensen, *Keilschrift. Bibl.*, ii, pp. 169, 170.

² Rm. 3, line 24, S. A. Smith, *Die Keilschrifttexte Asurbanipals*, ii, pp. 26, 27.

vad, sent his daughter to the harem with gifts, and so indicated his submission to the new tyrant. In like manner, also, Mukallu, a prince of Tabal, and Sandasharmé of Cicilia indicated their adherence to the empire.

In close connection with these submissions the historiographer of Asshurbanapal narrates with unction a curious double episode. The first part of it represents Gyges, king of Lydia, in far-off Asia Minor, dangerously pressed by the Cimmerians and dreaming that Asshurbanapal could and would save him. Forthwith he dispatched an embassy to the great king praying his assistance. When the border of Assyria was reached the leader of the horsemen was greeted with the Assyrian question, "Who then, art thou, stranger, thou from whose land no courier has yet made his way?" Unable to speak Assyrian, the ambassadors could make known their mission only by signs, but were at last conducted to Nineveh. After much search a man was found who could unravel the mystery and interpret the story of the dream.¹ Asshurbanapal sent no help in visible form, but was contented with beseeching Asshur and Ishtar to help Gyges against his adversaries. Thus assisted, Gyges attacked the on-moving hordes, gained a great victory, and sent two captured chiefs to Assyria as proof of the work

¹ The story of the ambassador's visit is told in Cylinder E, 1-12, G. Smith, *History of Assurbanipal*, pp. 76, 77; *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, ii, pp. 172, 173.

wrought by the gods of Assyria. There needed only that the converse should be proven, and the king's faith in his gods would be well fortified. The opportunity for this demonstration arose a little later when Psammetichus of Egypt had declared his independence. Gyges gave him support, and so broke his compact of friendship with Assyria. Asshurbanapal prayed again to his gods, and this time not for, but against, the faithless Gyges; whereupon the Cimmerians, whom he had easily conquered before, but were now led by Dugdamme and thoroughly disciplined, fell on him and possessed his entire land, while his dead body was cast out in the way before them. His son, who inherited a broken kingdom, asked the help of the Assyrians and their permission to occupy his heritage.¹

The fourth campaign was directed against the land of Man, where Akhsheri was king. The circumstances which led to the invasion are not clearly set forth, but there had probably been a rebellion against the monotonous tribute. The land had undoubtedly received many new inhabitants through the Indo-European invasion, and these were not likely to bear the tribute which the previous inhabitants had borne. The Assyrian army soon reduced the province to subjection, and the rebellious Akhsheri was numbered among the slain. His son, Ualli, succeeded to the throne,

¹ Rassam Cylinder, ii, 95-125, Jensen, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, ii, pp. 172-177.

and upon him was laid a heavier tribute, to be paid in horses.¹

At the same time Asshurbanapal made a raid upon Biris-Khadri, a Median prince, and upon Sarati and Parikhia, sons of Gagi,² prince of Sakhi. It ended with the taking of a few fortified cities and the deportation of the inhabitants.³ By such raids as this the Medes were being taught to hate the Assyrians, as the west had long since learned to hate them.

Again in the first half of his reign had Asshurbanapal to do with Elam. For a long time there had been peace between the two countries. As we have seen, the people of Elam had laid aside the old-time hostility to the Assyrians and had given over assisting their enemies. Ummanaldash had not received Merodach-baladan when he fled to him for refuge. And, as was still more remarkable, the Assyrians had shown great friendship and charity toward their erstwhile enemies. When a famine arose in Elam, Esarhaddon, displaying again his merciful side, suffered the Elamites who were in hunger to seek refuge in Babylonian territory and permitted the export of grain to others who remained in Elam. When the fam-

¹ Rassam Cylinder, ii, 126–iii, 26.

² Gagi has been often identified with Gog, Ezek. xxxviii, 2; for example, by Schrader *Keilinschriften und Geschichtsforschung*, p. 159, note, and Delitzsch, *Paradies*, p. 247, but this is hardly probable. An identification of Gog with Gyges, king of Lydia, is more likely. See E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Alterthums*, i, p. 558; Sayee, *sub voce*, *Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. Hastings, ii, p. 224.

³ Cylinder B, iii, 102–iv, 14, Jensen, *op. cit.*, pp. 178–181.

ine was past he gave a final and remarkable proof of his friendly purposes by arranging for the return to Elam of the temporary exiles. Such peace as this was too good for long continuance, and now was suddenly and rudely broken. We are not informed exactly as to the causes which induced Urtaki, king of Elam, to break the compact of friendship by a hostile invasion of Babylonia. Asshurbanapal did not at once repel the invaders, but delayed until they had reached Babylon itself, when he drove them not only from Babylon, but also over the borders into Elam.¹ Urtaki soon after died, and as a natural oriental consequence there were disturbances in his kingdom immediately afterward. His brother, Teumman, seized the throne, dispossessing both a son of Urtaki and another of the former king, Ummanaldash. These he tried to assassinate, but they, with seventy relatives, made their way to the court of Asshurbanapal, who gave them refuge and refused to deliver them up when demanded by Teumman. Teumman certainly had boldness fortified twice over, for he entered northern Babylonia and threatened the country to induce Asshurbanapal to deliver up the fugitives. Asshurbanapal, who was now celebrating some religious festivals in Assyria, instead of directly attacking and repulsing the invader, sent an army to Durilu, the old outpost against Elam. This move cut off the direct retreat of Teumman and compelled

¹ Cylinder B, iv, 15-83, Jensen, *op. cit.*, pp. 244-247.

him to return to his capital, Susa, by a road below the river Ulai (modern Karun). The Assyrian army then pursued, and overtaking him before Susa, administered a telling defeat. Teumman was taken soon afterward and killed. The remaining districts of Elam then capitulated, and Asshurbanapal made Ummanigash, one of the fugitives to his court, king; while his brother Tammaritu was set over one of the Assyrian provinces.

During the progress of these two campaigns the tribe of Gambuli was in a state of insurrection. Bel-iqisha was dead, and his sons, Dunanu and Sam'agunu, had succeeded him. These as well as Nabu-naid and Bel-etri, sons of Nabu-shum-eresh, had not given in their allegiance to Assyria. On the return from Elam the victorious Assyrian army marched through their land and destroyed Shapi-Bel, the capital city of the Gambuli. The four chiefs were carried in chains to Nineveh.

This series of campaigns against Egypt, the west, and the east filled about fifteen years of the reign of Asshurbanapal. They are a doleful catalogue of plundering raids and of attempts to crush frequent rebellions. Asshurbanapal was holding with extreme difficulty the empire which his fathers had built up. There were ominous cracks in the structure, for Egypt was likely to fall away at any time, while the Medes were already beginning to appreciate their own strength and to understand the weakness of Assyria. In no part of his great borders had Asshurbanapal made any

important gain to Assyrian territory. He had introduced no new policy, and was now barely holding his own, surrounded by dangers which menaced the continuance of the empire.

A danger greater than any other was now ready to come to the surface. During all these years there had been an external peace and calm in Babylonia. Shamash-shum-ukin had been acknowledged as king, in accordance with his father's will, and in his hands were now the internal affairs of Babylonia. This arrangement in the very nature of things could not endure, for the temper of the Babylonian people was utterly foreign to it. It might from certain points of view appear like an almost ideal arrangement. It gave freedom in all matters of local concern, and made it possible for the Babylonians to devote themselves to art, literature, and science, as they had always desired. But the Babylonian people could not be brought to any such devotion of their talents. They remembered the days of old when theirs was the world's chief city, and when the most sacred and solemn rites of religion were closely knit into the framework of their civil administration. How changed was all this! Their present ruler was the son of an Assyrian king, and, in the opinion of their priesthood, was no properly sanctified king at all. He was indeed no king for another reason. Assurbanapal was a man of such intense personality, of such overweening pride, that there could be no king beside him. Shamash-shum-ukin could

only be an underlord in charge of the internal affairs of a province. He was not paying tribute as similar princes in other provinces, but in every other particular his rule was that of a petty prince. This division of responsibilities between the two brothers had gone on well for fifteen years. There had been unusual peace and prosperity in Babylonia. There was entire freedom in Assyria for the continuance of war upon rebels, and there was no reason why the arrangement should not be continued as far as Assyria was concerned. Let only Shamash-shum-ukin continue to play the lesser part and all would be well.

But Shamash-shum-ukin was ambitious.¹ There was king's blood in him no less than in his elder brother, and he aspired to be the independent king of an independent kingdom. He saw that this could never be attained by Babylonia acting alone. He must have aid in some form from other states, and he had nothing to offer for their assistance. He began plotting such a series of rebellions against Assyria as would weaken the empire and hence leave him free from all danger of attack. The plan had elements of possible success. He could not get succor in a bold campaign against his brother unless he could offer gold or territory in return for the aid which he received.

¹ The inscriptions belonging to the reign of Shamash-shum-ukin have been published, translated, and explained in a masterly manner in C. F. Lehmann, *Shamashshumukin, König von Babylon, inschriftliches Material über den Beginn seiner Regierung, grossenteils zum ersten Male herausgegeben, übersetzt und erläutert*. Leipzig, 1892.

But by this method he might stir up Assyrian provinces to rebel, declaring that so they might easily win their independence. If a sufficient number of these rebellions could be started at one time, Assyria could not possibly put them down. Beaten on every side, Asshurbanapal must inevitably permit Shamash-shum-ukin to set up an independent kingdom. The aid received from the other states through their rebellions would be indirect only, and they would have compensation enough in their own freedom from the oppressor.

The weakness of the plan, however, far exceeded its strength. It was, in the first place, a plan that could not be carried on in secret, and secrecy alone could give it a chance of success. He might easily approach a people who thought that their present interests were rather with Assyria, and would therefore promptly reveal the plot. Once revealed, the Assyrians might readily evidence once more their virtue of promptness and overwhelm the traitorous Babylonians, as they had done before in the days of Merodach-baladan. Still further was the plan weak in that it took no account of the consequences which might follow the breaking up of the Assyrian empire. Assyria had more than once saved Babylonia from Aramaeans or Chaldeans who threatened to engulf the whole land. If the martial arm was now broken, Babylonia would become the instant prey of the Chaldeans. It is difficult to believe that a plot so fraught with dangerous consequences, involving

the possible ruin of the land, could have been hatched in a sane mind. It is charitable to suppose that Shamash-shum-ukin had been utterly carried away by ambition and by national pride, and had not fully weighed the dangers which he was calling into action.

The states which he decided to attempt to draw into rebellion almost completely hemmed in Assyria. The first of them was Accad, the portion of Babylonia, outside of Babylon, which still remained under Assyrian rule. The second was the Chaldean state in the far south—the old enemy not merely of Assyria, but also of Babylonia—and below this also the country of the Sea Lands. To these were added the Aramaean communities in Babylonia, Elam, and Gutium, under which last was now comprised a great stretch of territory above the Mesopotamian valley, populated by the Indo-Europeans who had entered it in the great migration. Finally he roused all the west land, Syria, Palestine, and Melukhkha. Egypt was already independent, pursuing its own way without Assyrian let or hindrance, and therefore could not be drawn into any such confederation.

As might have been expected in the beginning, Asshurbanapal had knowledge of the plot long before it was ready for execution. He did not, however, take steps for its destruction as promptly as might have been expected. Whether he was only playing a part or did in reality so feel, he at least spent many words in describing his

brother's faithlessness as a breach of gratitude. He claims to have done all manner of good deeds for him, and even declares that it was he who gave him the throne, though we have already seen that this act of folly was really done by Esarhaddon. His words have an air of solemn sincerity, and are characteristic of the general tenor of the records of his reign : "In those days Shamash-shum-ukin, a faithless brother, to whom I had done good, whom I had established in the kingship over Babylon, for whom . . . the insignia of royalty I had made and presented ; warriors, horses, chariots had I brought together and placed in his hands ; cities, fields, gardens, and they who dwelt in them . . . had I given him. But he forgot the grace I had wrought for him. . . ." ¹ It is a curious plaint for a king. It might have been expected that Asshurbanapal would have made even the suspicion of a plot excuse sufficient for an invasion of Babylonia and a severe castigation of his brother. He waited, however, until the breach of peace should come from the brother, hoping thereby, probably, to justify himself to the Babylonians as the maker of peace, and not its breaker, when the civil war was over.

Shamash-shum-ukin struck the first blow, being probably driven to it by the discovery of the plot. He first seized Ur and Uruk, which had Assyrian governors and were directly under the control of

¹ Rassam Cylinder, col. iii, 70-78, Jensen, *op. cit.*, pp. 182-185.

Asshurbanapal. He assumed the titles king of Sumer and Accad and king of Ammanu. He added to this high-handed breach of allegiance a notice to Asshurbanapal that he must no longer offer in Babylon and Borsippa the annual sacrifices which he had been giving as the suzerain of Babylon. He must not offer in Sippar to the god Shamash, nor in Kutha to the god Nergal. These cities were then seized, as Ur and Uruk had been, and fortified. Still Asshurbanapal did not attack, waiting now until he should receive from the gods some favorable omen. The omen came in the night, when it was far spent. He saw in a dream the moon bearing an inscription wherein was threatened all manner of famine, wrath, and death against anyone who should plot against Asshurbanapal. He need no longer delay. The army is set in motion and the border crossed. Shamash-shum-ukin dare not meet that army in open battle; his only hope was successful defense in the siege which soon must come. He had doubtless hoped for aid from some of his fellow-conspirators, but all failed him but one. This was Ummani-gash, king of Elam, who was won over by a present. His act was an act of ingratitude as well as of hostility, for he owed his throne to Asshurbanapal's appointment. The absence of Ummani-gash in Babylonia gave the favorable opportunity for a rebellion in Elam, in which his family was driven out and his brother, Tammaritu, seized the throne. This was a favorable move for Assyria,

as it compelled the withdrawal from Babylonia of the Elamite troops. Tammaritu, however, was also no friend of Assyria, and desired rather to make himself an ally of Babylonia. As soon, therefore, as he felt himself secure he likewise sent help to Shamash-shum-ukin.¹ At once the old swing of the pendulum began in Elam. Another rebellion broke out, Tammaritu was driven from the country, and Indabigash became king of Elam.² Tammaritu, as Teumman before him, sought refuge in Assyria, and Indabigash refused to have any share in the insurrection of Shamash-shum-ukin. The quickness with which these two Elamite rebellions had followed each other, and the manner in which they had finally played into the hands of Asshurbanapal, induce us to believe that he was the real cause of the second at least, if not also of the first.

The withdrawal of the Elamite support left Shamash-shum-ukin in a sorry plight. He had, indeed, a few troops sent from Arabia, but these were of slight weight. From the west there was no help at all, nor did the Aramaeans of Babylonia or the Chaldeans give aid. Shamash-shum-ukin held out as long as possible when besieged. At last he was conquered by hunger and disease. So awful was the suffering in Babylon that human flesh was used for food. When despair depressed all minds Shamash-shum-ukin committed suicide

¹ Rassam Cylinder, iv, 3-7, Jensen, *op. cit.*, pp. 188, 189.

² *Ibid.*, col. iv, 11.

by causing himself to be burned¹ as a sacrifice to the people who had suffered so much for his folly. When the gates were opened and Asshurbanapal entered the rebellious cities there was enacted an orgy of wrath and ferocity. Soldiers who had fought under the orders of Shamash-shum-ukin were adjudged to have spoken against Asshur and the great king of Assyria whom he had set up. Their tongues were torn from their mouths, and the bodies of their fellows who had died in the siege were cast out, to be devoured by wild beasts and carrion-eating birds. To supply the places of those in Babylon who were given over to horrible deaths men were brought from Kutha and Sippar.

Asshurbanapal had pacified the land of Babylonia as his ancestors would have done; he had given to it the silence of death. There remained only that he should devise now some method by which it could be governed. He decided to have no more government which might tend to a rupture between the two kingdoms, and so had himself proclaimed king under the name of Kandalanu,² adopting for Babylonia a different name, as Tiglathpileser III and Shalmaneser IV had done before him. The first year of his reign in Babylonia, according to the Canon of Ptolemy, was 647 B. C.³

¹ Rassam Cylinder, iv, 50–53, Jensen, *op. cit.*, pp. 190, 191.

² See Schrader, "Kinaladan und Asurbanipal," *Zeitschrift für Keilschriftforschung*, i, pp. 222–232; Pinches, "Some Recent Discoveries," *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, v, p. 6 (1882–83).

³ See above, vol. i, p. 334.

As soon as these matters were arranged he invaded the south and punished the Chaldeans, the Aramaeans, and the people of the Sea Lands who had given in their pledge to Shamash-shum-ukin to join in a general rebellion against Assyria. The yoke of bondage was put upon them, Assyrian governors set over them, and they were commanded to pay a regular annual tribute. In this Asshurbanapal gained a distinct advantage, for the territory was now more fully in his hands than it had been since the beginning of his reign.¹

Now that all Babylonia as far south as the Persian Gulf was entirely in a state of peace and no more uprisings were to be feared, Asshurbanapal determined likewise to punish Elam for having twice assisted the Babylonians in their rebellion. It is true that Indabigash had kept the peace until now with Assyria, but the country must suffer for the madness of its former kings. Another rebellion had broken out in Elam in which Indabigash had fallen and in his place Ummanaldash, son of Attumetu, had become king. There is no certain proof that this Attumetu was the same person as he who led a part of the army which Ummanigash had sent to the assistance of Shamash-shum-ukin, but the names are the same and the time fits the identity. If they are the same, we may perhaps see in Ummanaldash a man who was made king by the party which sympathized with the Babylonians, and was therefore

¹ Rassam Cylinder, iv, 97-109, Jensen, *op. cit.*, pp. 194, 195.

hostile to Indabigash, who had been pro-Assyrian in his acts, until just before the end of his reign. He had then offended Asshurbanapal by harboring Nabu-bel-shume, a descendant of Merodach-baladan. The latter was in the true line of his family in giving much trouble to the Assyrians. He had received from Asshurbanapal some Assyrian troops to protect his country—the Sea Lands—from Elamite invasion during the war with Shamash-shum-ukin. Nabu-bel-shume had at first played the part of a devoted friend of Assyria, and at the same time had laid his plans to destroy the faithfulness of his Assyrian guard, win them over to himself, and with this added force prepare to seize what advantage he could when Shamash-shum-ukin won his independence. The issue did not fall out that way, and he was compelled to flee his country and seek refuge in Elam, whither Merodach-baladan had fled before him.

Before the death of Indabigash Asshurbanapal had demanded of him the surrender of the fugitive Nabu-bel-shume and his renegade Assyrians. Indabigash refused, and Asshurbanapal threatened war. Before he reached Elam with his armies Indabigash was dead and Ummalaldash was on the throne.¹ With him the case was no better. If he was not actually made king, because of his hostility to Assyria, as suggested above, he was in any case as unfriendly as the anti-Assyrian party could desire. In spite, therefore, of the change of rulers

¹ Cylinder B, vii, 72–87, and C, 88–115, Jensen, *op. cit.*, pp. 266–269.

in Elam Asshurbanapal pressed on and took Bit-Imbi, a fortification on the borders. Ummandalash was too new to the throne to be able to turn attention to an invasion, and needed his strength to ward off another possible insurrection at home, in which he might lose his life, as had his predecessors. He therefore forsook his chief city, Madaktu, and fled into the mountains, to a place known as Dur-Undasi, before which flowed the river Ididi (probably the Disful). The river formed a natural defense, and here Ummandalash fortified himself as best he might. Asshurbanapal followed, taking the cities one by one as he went, that no dangers might be left in the rear. At last Madaktu fell, and with the other cities between it and the Ididi was thrown down and burned. When the Ididi was reached the river was at flood, and there was a strong reluctance in the army to attempt it. Their fears were overcome by a dream granted to the whole army, in which Ishtar of Arbela spoke and said, "I go before Asshurbanapal, the king, whom mine hands have created." It is interesting to observe how frequently omens, visions, and dreams figure in the records of this latter-day Assyrian king, and how very infrequent they are before his day. Thus encouraged, the troops crossed and Dur-Undasi was taken, but Ummandalash escaped into the mountains. Thereupon the whole land was devastated. Susa, the ancient capital, was taken, and in its palace Asshurbanapal began a work of pillage which it would be difficult to

parallel in all the earlier records. From the treasuries were brought forth the gold and silver which the kings of Elam, following Assyrian exemplars, had plundered in raids into Babylonia and elsewhere. Precious stones and costly woolen stuffs, chariots and wagons, horses and animals of various kinds, were sent away to Assyria. The temple, honored and endowed for ages, was broken open and the gods and goddesses with all their treasures were added to the moving mass of plunder. Thirty-two statues of kings wrought in gold, silver, and copper were carried away to Assyria to be added to the glories of the great conquest. Then the mausoleum of the kings was violated in order that even the bones of dead monarchs who vexed Assyria might be carried into the land which they had hated. In the end, when all that might add wealth to Assyria had been taken away, the entire land was left a smoking ruin, from which, in the very phrases of the ruthless destroyer, had been taken away "the voice of men, the tread of cattle and sheep, and the sound of happy music." Such is the record of a campaign led by a civilized monarch, who prided himself on his love of learning. The savagery of Assyria was not dead, but in full vigor; dormant at times it had been, and the acts of some kings had seemed to promise amendment and a serious desire to build up rather than to destroy. These purposes were more clearly shown in Tiglathpileser III and in Esarhaddon than in any other kings, but even they are limited

by their base racial instincts. In Asshurbanapal's campaign the worst elements had again come to the surface.¹

It is difficult to see how any national life could survive a ruin such as this, but Elam was not yet quite dead. Ummanaldash returned to Madaktu when the Assyrians had withdrawn, and sat down amid the ruins. To the last he remained faithful to Nabu-bel-shume, who had continued with him. Learning that they were together, Asshurbanapal sent an embassy to demand his surrender. Nabu-bel-shume, thus hounded to death, and looking over a land which had been ruined at least partly for his sake, ordered his armor-bearer to run him through. Worn out with fruitless opposition, Ummanaldash sent the body of the dead man and the head of the armor-bearer who had slain him to Asshurbanapal. Again the brutality of the man was shown. He cut off the head from the dead body and suspended it about the neck of one of Shamash-shum-ukin's followers, and commanded that the poor body should not receive even the honor of a burial.²

In the western part of Elam Pa'e had attempted to gain a position and set up a new kingdom, to control a part of the now ruined land. But an army dispatched against him brought him quickly

¹ For the history of the campaign see Rassam Cylinder, v, 63-vii, 81, Jensen, *op. cit.*, pp. 198-215, and compare Billerbeck, *Susa*, pp. 112-118.

² Rassam Cylinder, vii, 38-41. The sense of the passage is incorrectly given in Jensen's excellent translation in *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, ii, p. 213. Comp. Meissner in the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, x, 83.

to his senses. He came to Assyria and offered his allegiance and submission to Asshurbanapal. Soon afterward Ummamaldash lost the throne and was captured by the Assyrians.

So ended the dealings of King Asshurbanapal with the neighboring states, whose civilization was at least as old as that of Assyria, and whose treatment of other nations was not so bad. He did not attempt to supply the land with a new government and with the blessings of good administration, as Tiglathpileser III would have done. He was content to have deprived it of all possible opportunity of interfering with his own plans by further alliance with rebels in Babylonia. The policy was singularly deficient in farsightedness; it is indeed to be properly characterized as folly. A castigation of Elam may have been necessary from the Assyrian point of view, but its obliteration was stupidity. It formed a good buffer state against the Indo-European population of Media, and should have been made an ally against the new power which must soon become an important factor in the polities of western Asia. Instead of this Asshurbanapal had only opened a way over which the destroyers might march when their hour should come.

In close connection with the Elamite campaigns, and perhaps at the same time, Asshurbanapal undertook the punishment of the Arabians for the assistance, direct and indirect, which they had given to Shamash-shum-ukin. In the extreme

northern part of the Arabian peninsula was the kingdom of Aribi, which has often before appeared in the Assyrian story. Yauta, son of Hazael, who ruled in it along with Queen Adiya, had doubly aided Shamash-shum-ukin. He had, according to compact, seized an entire independence for his little kingdom, and with that had also captured a number of localities in Arabia, Edom, Yabrud, Beth-Ammon, the Hauran, Moab, Sa'arri, Khargi, and Subiti.¹ In these places he had settled some of his Arabic hordes who were clamoring for space for expansion beyond his own narrow borders. This movement was an indirect aid to Shamash-shum-ukin of the greatest value, and if similar movements had taken place elsewhere as planned, the empire must have fallen to pieces under the combined assault. Furthermore, Yauta had rendered direct help of first-rate importance by sending an army of Kedarenes (Assyrian, Kadri or Kidri) under the command of two sheikhs, Abiyate and Ayamu. These Kedarenes were driven from Babylonia, and at least one of their leaders was taken. The Arabian settlers were in every case overwhelmed by the local Assyrian troops. The help had indeed availed little for Shamash-shum-ukin, but only because there had been no help from other points whence it had been expected. Yauta fled into the small kingdom of Nabatheans, and Uaite, a nephew of his, gained the throne in Aribi. He dared oppose the

¹ Probably Zobah, 2 Sam. x, 6, 8; 1 Kings xi, 23, etc.

Assyrians who came to take revenge for the assistance which his predecessor had given to the Babylonian rebellion. He was captured, bound in chains like a dog, placed in a cage, and carried to Assyria to be set at a door as one might set a watchdog.¹ To such petty and disgusting forms of punishment had an Assyrian king descended.

As a part of the same campaign Asshurbanapal took vengeance also upon Ammuladi, a sheikh of the Kedarenes, because they had been the men sent to Babylonia by the former king of Aribi, on whom they were dependent. Ammuladi had sought refuge in Palestine, where he was conquered and taken. Adiya, the queen of Aribi, was also taken, and Abiyate made king of Aribi.

Abiyate held this post but a short time. The events which led to his removal are not quite clear; but it seems probable that he made some arrangement with Uaite, the son of Bir-Dadda, who had declared himself king of Aribi, for later Abiyate appears as sheikh of the Kedarenes.

A new alliance against Asshurbanapal was soon formed, composed of Natnu, king of the Nabatheans; Uaite, king of Aribi; and Abiyate, prince of the Kedarenes. The union of these three was a matter of no mean concern, and Asshurbanapal may well have been stirred by it. He led an army into the wilds of Arabia, but did not penetrate into the territory of the Nabatheans. All the conspirators save Natnu were captured and taken to Assyria.

¹ Rassam Cylinder, ix, 95–109, Jensen, *op. cit.*, pp. 226–229.

On the return from this campaign the cities of Ushu, belonging to the territory of Sidon, and Akko, which had joined in a rebellion, were severely punished.¹

One more word only concerning the external relations of Assyria stands written in the records of Asshurbanapal, and it is of peace and not of war. King Sarduris of Urartu sent to Asshurbanapal messengers bearing presents and words of friendliness.² Urartu was once more strong enough to maintain some sort of independence. Assyria had abandoned its attempts to wreck the little kingdom, and the two were friendly neighbors. They needed so to be, for each required the help of the other in warding off the Indo-European invasion that could not much longer be postponed. Urartu must soon fall a victim, and the danger to Assyria was scarcely less great.

The Cimmerian swarms who had overwhelmed Gyges, and then possessed the fertile plains and valleys of Asia Minor as far as Sardes, returned later upon their course and harassed the borders of the weakened empire of Asshurbanapal. When Dugdamme³ was dead his son, Sandakshatra, was still able to control and discipline his followers and hurl them against the Assyrian outposts. Their

¹ Rassam Cylinder, ix, 115–128, Jensen, *op. cit.*, pp. 228, 229.

² Rassam Cylinder, x, 40–50, Jensen, *op. cit.*, pp. 230, 231.

³ Dugdamme has been correctly identified by Sayee (*Academy*, 1893, p. 277) with Lygdamis (Strabo, i, iii, § 21), whose name must now be read Διγδαμης instead of Λεγδαμης.

menace lasted unto the very end of the great king's days.¹

The closing years of Asshurbanapal's long and laborious reign were largely spent in works of peace. Even during the stormy years he had had great interest in the erection of buildings and the collection and copying of books for his library. In such congenial tasks his later days were chiefly spent.

It is not possible to determine in every case where the buildings were located which he rebuilt or otherwise beautified. The temple of E-kur-gal-kurra, in Nineveh, he adorned magnificently and supplied with a new statue of the god. The temple of E-sagila, in Babylon, which Sennacherib had destroyed and Esarhaddou partially rebuilt, he completed and restored to it with elaborate pomp and ceremony the god Marduk and his consort Zarpant, whom Sennacherib had carried into Assyria. The temple of E-zida, in Borsippa, also received new ornaments. Long lists of colossal works elsewhere in Babylon, in Arbela, in many a lesser place, which he carried on, have come down to us. Above all these works stood the reconstruction of the vast palace in Nineveh, occupied during his life by Sennacherib. From the foundation stone to the roof was this rebuilt in a style of magnificence never seen before.²

In this palace he lived when war did not call

¹ See Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, i, pp. 492-496.

² Rassam Cylinder, x, 51-113, Jensen, *op. cit.*, pp. 230-235.

him, and here he slowly gathered his great library —the chief pride of his life. The two kingdoms were ransacked for the clay books which had been written in days gone by. Works of grammar, of lexicography, of poetry, history, science, and religion were brought from ancient libraries in Babylonia. They were carefully copied in the Assyrian style, with notes descriptive, chronological, or explanatory, by the scholars of the court, and the copies were preserved in the palace, while the originals went back to the place whence they were borrowed. The library thus formed numbered many thousands of books. In it the scholars, whom Asshurbanapal patronized so well, worked carefully on in the writing of new books on all the range of learning of the day. Out of an atmosphere like that came the records of Asshurbanapal's own reign. Small wonder is it that under such conditions his historical inscriptions should be couched in a style finished, elegant, and rhythmical, with which the bare records of fact of previous reigns may not be compared at all.

In the year 626 Asshurbanapal died, and the kingdom which he left was very unlike the kingdom which he had received of his father. It was, indeed, still the chief power of western Asia, but it was not the only power. The day of its unparalleled glory and honor was past. Its borders had shrunk sadly, for Egypt was lost, Urartu was independent, Syria and Palestine were almost at liberty, and the northeastern provinces were slowly

but surely casting in their lot with the Manda. The reign of Asshurbanapal had been one of unexampled glory in the arts and vocations of peace. The temples were larger, more beautiful, more rich in storied liturgy. Science, whether astronomy or mathematics, had reached a higher point than in the history of man before. The literature of Assyria, though laden with a cumbrous system of writing and a monumental style which was inherited from the age when slabs of stone were the only writing material, had, nevertheless, under royal patronage taken on a marvelous development. Books of song and story, of religion and of law, of grammar and of lexicography, were produced in extraordinary numbers and of remarkable style and execution. The pride of the Assyrians swelled as they looked on all these things, and saw beside them the marvelous material prosperity which likewise had exceeded all the old bounds. The Assyrian trader was in all lands, and his wealth was growing apace. In all these things Asshurbanapal had marched in advance of his predecessors.

In war only had he failed. But by the sword the kingdom of Assyria had been founded, by the sword it had added kingdom unto kingdom until it had become a world empire. By the sword it had cleared the way for the advance of its trader, and opened up to civilization great territories, some of which, like Urartu, had even adopted its method of writing. It had held all the vast empire together by the sword, and not by beneficent and

unselfish rule. Even unto this very reign barbaric treatment of men who yearned for liberty had been the rule and not the exception. That which had been founded by the sword and maintained by the sword would not survive if the sword lost its keenness or the arm which wielded it lost its strength or readiness. This had happened in the days of Asshurbanapal. He had conquered but little new territory, made scarcely any advance, as most of the kings who preceded him had done. He had not only not made distinct advances, he had actually beaten a retreat, and the empire was smaller. Worse than even this, he had weakened the borders which remained, and had not erected fortresses, as had Sargon and Esarhaddon and even Sennacherib, for the defense of the frontier against aggression. He had gained no new allies, and had shown no consideration or friendship for any people who might have been won to join hands with Assyria when the hour of struggle between the Semites and the Indo-Europeans should come. On the contrary, his brutality, singularly unsuited to his period and his position of growing weakness, his bloodthirstiness, his destructive raids into the territories of his neighbors, had increased the hatred of Assyria into a passion. All these things threatened the end of Assyrian prestige, if not the entire collapse of the empire.

The culture which Asshurbanapal had nurtured and disseminated was but a cloak to cover the nakedness of Assyrian savagery. It never became

a part of the life of the people. It contributed not to national patriotism, but only to national enervation. Luxury had usurped the place of simplicity and weakness had conquered strength. The most brilliant color of all Assyrian history was only overlaid on the palace and temple walls. The shadows were growing long and deep, and the night of Assyria was approaching.
²

CHAPTER XI.

THE FALL OF ASSYRIA.

ASSHURBANAPAL had maintained internal peace in his empire, and the prosperity which Nineveh had enjoyed was conducive to a quiet passing of the succession. He was followed by his son, Asshur-etyl-ili-ukinni, who is also known by the shortened form of his name as Asshur-etyl-ili. Of his reign we possess only two inscriptions. The first occurs in a number of copies, and reads only, "I am Asshur-etyl-ili, king of Kisshati, king of Assyria, son of Asshurbanapal, king of Kisshati, king of Assyria. I caused bricks to be made for the building of E-zida in Calah, for the life of my soul I caused them to be made."¹ The second gives his titles and genealogy in the same manner, and adds a note concerning the beginning of his reign, but it is not now legible. Besides these two texts there remain only a few tablets found at Nippur dated in the second and the fourth years of his reign.² These latter show that as late as the fourth year of his reign he still held the title

¹ Published I R. 8, No. 3, translated by Winckler, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, ii, pp. 268, 269.

² Hilprecht, "Keilinschriftliche Funde," in *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, iv, pp. 164, ff. See also Messerschmidt, *Die Inschrift der Stele Nabuna'id's*, p. 12, note 1.

of king of Sumer and Accad, and therefore continued to rule over a large portion of Babylonia, if not over the city of Babylon itself.

The ruined remains of his palace at Calah have been found, and it forms a strange contrast to the imposing work of Sargon. Its rooms are small and their ceilings low; the wainscoting, instead of fine alabaster richly carved, was formed only of slabs of roughly cut limestone, and it bears every mark of hasty construction.¹

We have no other remains of his reign, nor do we know how long it continued. Assyrian records terminate suddenly in the reign of Asshurbanapal, in which we reach at once the summit and the end of Assyrian carefulness in recording the events of reigns and the passage of time. It is, of course, possible that there may be buried somewhere some records yet unfound of this reign, but it is certain that they must be few and unimportant, else would they have been found in the thoroughly explored chambers in which so many royal historical inscriptions have been discovered. It may seem strange at first that an abundant mass of inscription material for this reign should not have been produced; that, in other words, a period of extraordinary literary activity should be suddenly followed by a period in which scarcely anything beyond bare titles should be written. But this is not a correct statement of the case. The literary

¹ Layard, *Nineveh and its Remains*, ii, pp. 38, 39; *Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 558.

productivity did not cease with Asshur-etyl-ilukinni. It had already ceased while Asshurbanapal was still reigning. The story, as above set forth, shows that we have no knowledge of the later years of his reign. The reign of Asshur-etyl-ilukinni only continued the dearth of record which the later years of Asshurbanapal had begun. As in some other periods of Assyrian history, there was indeed but little to tell. In his later days Asshurbanapal had remained quietly in Nineveh, interested more in luxury and in his tablets or books than in the salvation of his empire. In quietness somewhat similar the reign of his successor probably passed away. He had no enthusiasm and no ability for any new conquests. He could not really defend that which he already had. The air must have been filled with rumors of rebellion and with murmurs of dread concerning the future. The future was out of his power, and he could only await, and not avert, the fate of Assyria. It did not come in his reign, and the helpless empire was handed on to his successor.

There is doubt as to who the next king of Assyria may have been. Mention is found of a certain king whose name was Sin-shum-lishir, who must have reigned during this period, and perhaps it was he who followed the son of Asshurbanapal upon the throne. Whether that be true or not, we have no word of his doings.

The next king of Assyria known to us was Sin-shar-ishkun. He had come to the throne in sorry

times, and that he managed for some years to keep some sort of hold upon the falling empire is at least surprising. No historical inscription, in the proper sense of the word, has come down to us from his reign. One badly broken cylinder,¹ for which there are some fragmentary duplicates, has been found in which there are the titles and some words of empty boasting concerning the king's deeds. Besides this we have only three brief business documents found in Babylonia.² These are, however, very interesting because they are dated two of them in Sippar and the third in Uruk. The former belong to the second year of the king's reign and the latter to the seventh year. From this interesting discovery it appears that for seven years at least Sin-shar-ishkun was acknowledged as king over a portion of Babylonia, though the city of Babylon was not included in this district.

We have no knowledge of the events of his reign based on a careful record, as we have had before, and what little we do know is learned chiefly from the Babylonian inscriptions. The Greeks and Latins contradict each other so sharply, and are so commonly at variance with facts, amply substantiated in Babylonian documents, that very little can be made out of them. It is a fair inference from the records of Nabonidus, whose histo-

¹ I R. 8, 6, translated by Winckler, *Keilschrift. Bibl.*, ii, pp. 270, 271.

² Everts in Strassmaier's *Babylonische Texte*, vi, B., p. 90; Winckler, *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, 18 May, 1889, col. 636, footnote, and King, "Sin-shar-ishkun and His Rule in Babylonia," *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, ix, pp. 396, ff.

riographers have written carefully of this period, that Sin-shar-ishkun was a man of greater force than his predecessor. He already possessed a part of Babylonia, and desired to make his dominion more strong and compact, and also wished to increase it by taking from the new Chaldean empire, of which there is much to be told later, some of its fairest portions. Nabopolassar was now king of Babylon, and Sin-shar-ishkun invaded the territory of Babylonia when Nabopolassar was absent from his capital city carrying on some kind of campaign in northern Mesopotamia directed against the Subaru. This cut off the return of Nabopolassar, and brought even Babylon itself into danger. What was to be done in order to save his capital but secure allies from some quarter who could assist in driving out the Assyrians? The campaign of Nabopolassar had won for him the title of king of Kisshati, which he uses in 609, at which time he was in possession of northern Mesopotamia. It was probably this year or the year before (610 or 609) that Sin-shar-ishkun attacked the Babylonian provinces. Nabopolassar found it very difficult to secure an ally who would give aid without exacting too heavy a price. If Elam had still been a strong country, it would have formed the natural ally, as it had been traditionally the friend of the Chaldeans. But Elam was a waste land. The only possible hope was in the north and west. To the Ummān-Manda must he go for help. At the time of Nabopolassar, and

also as late as Nabonidus, the word Manda was used generally as a term for the nomadic peoples of Kurdistan and the far northeastern lands. The Babylonians, indeed, knew very little of these peoples. The Assyrians had come very closely into touch with them at several times since the days of Esarhaddon. They had felt the danger which was threatened by the growth of a new power on their borders, and they had suffered the loss of a number of fine provinces through it. This new power was Indo-European, and the people who founded and led it are confused by the Greek historians of a later day with the Medes. To appeal to the Manda for help in driving out the Assyrians from Babylonia was nothing short of madness. There were many points of approach between Babylonia and Assyria, there were many between Assyria and Chaldea. There was no good reason why these two peoples should not unite in friendship and prepare to oppose the further extension of the power of the Manda. The Assyrians certainly knew that the Manda coveted Assyria and the great Mesopotamian valley, and the Babylonians might easily have learned this if they did not already know it.

But Nabopolassar either did not know of the plans and hopes of the Manda, or, knowing them, hoped to divert them from himself against Assyria, and he ventured to invite their assistance. They came not for the profit of Nabopolassar, the Chaldeans, and Babylonia, but for their own aggran-

dizement. Sin-shar-ishkun and his Assyrian army were driven back from northern Babylonia into Assyria, and Nabopolassar at once possessed himself of the new provinces. The Manda pushed on after the Assyrians, retreating toward Nineveh. Between them there could only be the deepest hostility. In the forces of the Manda or Seythians¹ there must be inhabitants of provinces which had been ruthlessly ravaged by Assyrian conquerors. They had certainly old grievances to revenge, and were likely to spare not. There is evidence in abundance that Assyria was hated all over western Asia, and probably also in Egypt. For ages she had plundered all peoples within the range of her possible influence. Everywhere that her name was known it was execrated. The voice of the Phoenician cities is not heard as it is lifted in wrath and hatred against the great city of Nineveh, but a Hebrew prophet, Nahum, utters the undoubted feeling of the whole Western world when, in speaking of the ruin of Assyria, he says, "All that hear the bruit of thee [the report of thy fall] clap the hands over thee: for upon whom hath not thy wickedness passed continually?"²

Nabopolassar did not join with the Manda in the pursuit of the Assyrians, for he was anxious to settle and fix his own throne and attend to the

¹The name Manda in the Babylonian texts applies to the same peoples that are called Sakæ or Seythians by the Greeks. See Delattre, *Le Peuple et l'Empire des Medes*, p. 190; Winckler, *Untersuchungen zur altorientalischen Geschichte*, pp. 112, 124, 125.

²Nah. iii, 19.

reorganization of the provinces which were now added to the empire. If the Manda had needed help, they might easily have obtained it, for many a small or great people would gladly have joined in the undoing of Nineveh for hatred's sake or for the sake of the vast plunder which must have been stored in the city. For centuries the whole civilized world had paid unwilling tribute to the great city, and the treasure thus poured into it had not all been spent in the maintenance of the standing army. Plunder beyond dreams of avarice was there heaped up awaiting the despoiler. The Manda would be willing to dare single-handed an attack on a city which thus promised to enrich the successful. The Babylonians, or rather the Chaldeans, had given up the race, content to secure what might fall to them when Assyria was broken by the onslaught of the Manda. It will later appear in this narrative that Egypt was anxious to share in the division of the spoil of Assyria, and actually dispatched an expedition northward. This step was, however, taken too late, and the Egyptians were not on the ground until the last great scene was over. The unwillingness of Nabopolassar and the hesitancy or delay of other states left the Manda alone to take vengeance upon Assyria. Whether the fleeing Assyrians made a stand at any point before falling back upon the capital or not we do not know. If they did, they were defeated and at last were compelled to take refuge in the capital city. The

Manda began a siege. The memory which the Greeks and Latins handed down from that day represented the Assyrians as so weak that they would fall an easy prey to any people. This was certainly erroneous. There is a basis of truth for the story of weakness, for there were evident signs of decay during the reign of Asshurbanapal. These had, however, not gone so far as to make the power of Assyria contemptible. Weakened though the empire had been by the loss of the northern provinces through the great migrations, and weakened though it had been by the loss of Egypt, and weakened though it had been by the terrible civil war between Asshurbanapal and Shamash-shum-ukin, it was still the greatest single power in the world. It had, indeed, lost the power of aggression which had swept over mountain and valley, but in defense it would still be a dangerous antagonist.

When the Scythian forces came up to the walls of Nineveh they found before them a city better prepared for defense¹ than any had probably ever been in the world before. The vast walls might seem to defy any engines that the semibarbaric hordes of the new power could bring to bear. Within was the remnant of an army which had won a thousand fields. If the army was well managed and the city had had some warning of the ap-

¹ See Billerbeck und Jeremias, "Der Untergang Nineveh's und die Weissagungsschrift des Nahum von Elkosch," *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, iii, pp. 87-188.

proaching siege, it would be safe to predict that the contest must be long and bloody. The people of Nineveh must feel that not only the supremacy of western Asia, but their very existence as an independent people, was at stake. The Assyrians would certainly fight with the intensity of despair. We do not know, unfortunately, the story of that memorable siege. A people civilized for centuries was walled in by the forces of a new people fresh, strong, invincible. Then, as often in later days, civilization went down before barbarism. Nineveh fell into the hands of the Scythians. Later times preserved a memory that Sin-shar-ishkun perished in the flames of his palace, to which he had committed himself when he foresaw the end.¹

The city was plundered of everything of value which it contained, and then given to the torch. The houses of the poor, built probably of unburnt bricks, would soon be a ruin. The great palaces, when the cedar beams which supported the upper stories had been burnt off, fell in heaps. Their great, thick walls, built of unburnt bricks with the outer covering of beautiful burnt bricks, cracked open, and when the rains descended the unburnt bricks soon dissolved away into the clay of which they had been made. The inhabitants had fled to the four winds of heaven and returned

¹ Abydenus, Frag. 7. Müller-Didot, *Frag. Hist. Græc.*, iv, pp. 282, 283, narrates that Saracos so met his end, and it is now generally believed that he is Sin-shar-ishkun.

no more to inhabit the ruins. A Hebrew prophet, Zephaniah, a contemporary of the great event, has described this desolation as none other: "And he will stretch out his hand against the north, and destroy Assyria; and will make Nineveh a desolation, and dry like the wilderness. And herds shall lie down in the midst of her, all the beasts of the nations: both the pelican and the porcupine shall lodge in the chapters thereof: their voice shall sing in the windows; desolation shall be in the thresholds: for he hath laid bare the cedar work. This is the joyous city that dwelt carelessly, that said in her heart, I am, and there is none else beside me: how is she become a desolation, a place for beasts to lie down in! everyone that passeth by her shall hiss, and wag his hand."¹ Nineveh fell in the year 607 or 606, and the waters out of heaven, or from the overflowing river made the soft clay into a covering over the great palaces and their records. The winds bore seeds into the mass, and a carpet of grass covered the mounds, and stunted trees grew out of them. Year by year the mound bore less and less resemblance to the site of a city, until no trace remained above ground of the magnificence that once had been. In 401 B. C. a cultivated Greek² leading homeward the fragment of his gallant army of ten thousand men passed by the mounds

¹ Zeph. ii, 13-15.

² Xenophon (*Anabasis*, iii, iv, §1) in passing between Larissa and Mespila went close by the ruins.

and never knew that beneath them lay the palaces of the great Assyrian kings. In later ages the Parthians built a fortress on the spot, which they called Ninus, and other communities settled either above the ruins or near to them.¹ Men must have homes, and the ground bore no trace of the great city upon which dire and irreparable vengeance had fallen. But, though cities might be built upon the soil and men congregate where the Assyrian cities had been, there was in reality no healing of the wound which the Manda had given. The Assyrian empire had come to a final end. As they had done unto others so had it been done unto them. For more than a thousand years of time the Assyrian empire had endured. During nearly all of this vast period it had been building and increasing. The best of the resources of the world had been poured into it. The leadership of the Semitic race had belonged to it, and this was now yielded up to the Chaldeans, who had become the heirs of the Babylonians, from whom the Assyrians had taken it.

It remained only to parcel out, along with the rest of the plunder, the Assyrian territory. The Manda secured at this one stroke the old territory of Assyria, together with all the northern provinces as far west as the river Halys, in Asia Minor. To the Chaldeans, who were now masters in Baby-

¹For the later history of the site see Lincke, "Continuance of the Names of Assyria and Nineveh after 607-606 B. C.", in the *Memoirs of the IX Oriental Congress* at London, 1891, and *Assyria und Niniveh in Geschichte und Sagen der Mittelmeervölker* (nach 607-606), 1894.

lonia, there came the Mesopotamian possessions and, as we shall later see, the Syro-phoenician likewise. By this change of ownership the Semites retained the larger part of the territory over which they had long been masters, but the Indo-Europeans had made great gains. A life-and-death struggle would soon begin between them for the possession of western Asia.

BOOK IV: THE HISTORY OF THE CHALDEAN EMPIRE.

CHAPTER I.

THE REIGN OF NABOPOLASSAR.

WHEN Asshurbanapal died, in 626, he left, as we have already seen, an empire sadly weakened and far departed from its ancient glory. He had, indeed, held together the main body of it, but the outer provinces had mostly fallen away. He had left in the world many enemies of Assyria and sadly few friends. He had held Babylonia to the empire after displaying such fierceness in the punishment of its rebels as made them unable to rise again during his lifetime. Up to his death he reigned as king in Assyria under the name of Asshurbanapal, and in Babylon as Kandalanu.¹

¹ It had come to be established as almost a usual rule for the Assyrian king who reigned in Babylon to have another name than that used in Assyria, as witness Tiglathpileser III and Shalmaneser IV. George Smith first suggested (*History of Assurbanipal*, pp. 323, 324) that Kandalanu and Asshurbanapal were the same person, and Schrader ("Kinaladan and Asurbanipal" in *Zeitschrift für Keilschriftforschung*, i, pp. 222–232) attempted to demonstrate it. Oppert was not convinced by the argument ("La Vraie Personalité et les dates du roi Chinaladan," *Revue d'Assyriologie*, i, pp. 1–11), and Sayee agrees with him. On the other hand, Assyriologists

The hour of his death was the signal for the preparation of a new revolt in Babylonia. This was inevitable. The Babylonians had hated Assyrian rule since the conciliatory policy of Esarhaddon had ceased, and were ready for any attempt which might promise to restore to them the prestige they once possessed and to their city the primacy of the world. To achieve such marvels of history there was no further strength in themselves. We have seen long since the decay of the real Babylonian people, who had early ceased to be Semites of pure blood. But the very intermixing of other fresh blood had kept them alive as an entity, though it had almost entirely destroyed their identity. The reinforcement of life which came to them from the Kassites had kept awake in them a national separateness, when without it they would almost certainly have been swallowed up and lost, as other peoples had been before them. They were, however, steadily decaying and diminishing, and could only be kept further alive by a new influx of fresh blood from some source. The Assyrian kings had repeatedly settled colonists in various parts of Babylonia, from the days of Tiglathpileser III onward. These lost their national identity and became Babylonians to all intents and purposes.

generally accept the identity of Asshurbanapal and Kandalanu (Tiele, *Bab. assyr. Gesch.*, pp. 412-414; Winckler, *Geschichte*, pp. 135, 282, 289; King, art. "Babylonia" in *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, i, col. 451). Hommel (art. "Assyria" in Hastings's *Bible Dictionary*, i, p. 189) thinks that the evidence is indecisive, and leaves the question open.

It is a striking evidence that the Babylonians still possessed a certain distinctive influence, that they were able to absorb alien elements in this manner. Even with the accession of strength which came from these colonizations the Babylonian people would not have possessed enough vitality to make any insurrection against Assyria. They might join in one, but the motive force must be supplied by a nation which had in it fresher life and greater vitality. A people possessing the necessary force was at hand, and the insurrection would soon and speedily become a revolution. When Asshur-etyl-ili-ukinni was crowned king of Assyria he could also claim to be king of Babylon, for the hour of open rebellion was not yet come.¹ As we have seen, the Assyrians continued during his entire reign to hold a considerable portion of Babylonia, and even so late as the seventh year of his successor, Sin-shar-ishkun,² they still retained much. The city of Babylon was apparently lost in the very beginning, and Nabopolassar

¹ There has been found at Nippur a tablet dated in the fourth year of Asshuretililani (see Hilprecht, "Keilinschrifliche Funde in Niffer," *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, iv, p. 167), which shows that he was acknowledged as king of Babylonia in Nippur as late as 621 B. C.

² The relationship of Sin-shar-ishkun to Asshuretililani is made clear in a tablet published by Scheil ("Sin-shar-ishkun, fils d'Assurbanipal," *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, xi, pp. 47, ff.). A contract tablet from Uruk dated in the seventh year of Sin-shar-ishkun (King, "Sin-shar-ishkun and His Rule in Babylonia," *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, ix, pp. 396-400) would seem to show that his rule was officially recognized in Uruk at about 612 B. C. Tablets also exist (Evets, *Inscriptions of the Reigns of Evil-Merodach, Neriglissar, and Laborosoarchod*, pp. 90, 91; Winckler, *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, 18 May, 1889, col. 636, footnote) dated at Sippara in the second year of Sin-shar-ishkun.

gradually gained in power and influence through a successful revolution. It was spontaneous, but had been slowly maturing for years. The Babylonian people did not profit by it as a people, but were, on the contrary, engulfed in it and practically disappeared from history. They were able to push forward again, and even supplied later a king to the empire which resulted from the revolution. The old influence in the world, however, never returned, and they were soon absorbed into a later population and are heard of no more. That another people should be able first to gain leadership over the Babylonians, who had founded a mighty empire and had stood with the Egyptians as the leading nations of civilization, and then to overwhelm them and take their place in the world's history, is indeed an event of moment. We shall need to give heed to the people who could accomplish a feat so great. They must belong to the world's greatest races, and behind them must have been a period during which they had been prepared for their momentous destiny.

The people who wrought this revolution were the Chaldeans, whom we have already met as bitter enemies of the Assyrians. They were not less enemies of the Babylonians, as we have also seen, and a union of feeling between Babylonia and Assyria was brought about in the time of Merodach-baladan, when the Babylonians looked upon the Assyrians as their natural defenders against these unwelcome invaders. The Assyrians had, how-

ever, done no more than drive them southward or hold them in check. They had not driven them from the country entirely, but left them to become slowly attached to the soil, and a genuine portion of the population. The origin of the Chaldeans is obscure, but some facts concerning them may be considered as fairly well known. They invaded Babylonia from the south, coming from the neighborhood of the Persian Gulf. Whence they had come into the Sea Lands at that point is nearly as well known by a process of elimination. They could not have come from Elam, and they must therefore be settlers from Arabia. From what part of that old home land of Semites they had come is not known. It is, however, clear that they were Semites. They bore Semitic names, as far as any of their names are known to us, and they readily adapted themselves to Semitic customs, whether of religion, government, or social life. Their appearance in Babylonia was at an early date, and they had gradually spread in scattered communities over a considerable portion of the country, both north and south. In this they form a close parallel to the Aramaeans, who belonged, indeed, to the same general wave of migration as themselves, and had early proved dangerous neighbors to the Assyrians.

The chief stronghold of the Chaldeans was the territory known as the Sea Lands. This country was somewhat larger than the alluvial lands about the mouths of the rivers, as it apparently included

a strip of territory of unknown extent along the Arabian coast of the Persian Gulf. It had a government and a history of its own, running back through the centuries, of which, however, only fragments are known to us. That part of its history which is known is little more than a story of a half-nomad, half-agricultural and pastoral people who kept up a running fire of efforts to possess themselves of the rich lands and wealthy cities of their more fortunate Babylonian neighbors. The other Chaldean communities have left even less mark of their individuality upon history. They formed, indeed, principalities, which the boastfulness of Assyrian kings has elevated into large kingdoms and endowed with great armies, and with forces which could only be overcome by the might of the great god Asshur. Like their more numerous fellows in the Sea Lands, these also were anxious chiefly to find a leader who could give into their hands the possessions of the Babylonians. Any prince of one of these small states or communities who could win battles over the native Babylonians was sure of a following of Chaldeans generally, and not merely of the men of his own community. This was the surest way of coming out of the limitations of a petty principedom in Bit-Yakin, or in the Sea Lands, and of becoming the king of Kaldi Land. A man who could gain the title of king of Babylon or of king of Sumer and Accad would stand so much above his fellow-princes among the Chaldeans that he

might well be called by the lesser title of king of Kaldi. This fact goes far to explain the constant attempts of Chaldean princes upon Babylon. They were not moved by a sentimental appreciation of the glories of Babylon and its ancient royal titles, as were Tiglathpileser III and Sargon. They thirsted for power over the Babylonians because it brought wealth and ease, and with these headship among their own Chaldean peoples. This leadership among the Chaldeans had, however, more than once wrecked their hopes, when by contact with Babylonians they had learned more of the beauty and dignity of Babylonian civilization and come to recognize in the title an expression not so much of wealth as of honor, a headship in civilization. From such ideas they were dragged down by the Chaldean population, who thirsted after the wealth and demanded that they should receive the well-cultivated lands and the city property. These demands had been measurably granted by Merodach-baladan, and as a direct consequence of this compliance his new rule was promptly shattered by the Assyrians, and Chaldean supremacy was postponed.

As we have already said, however, the Chaldeans had not disappeared during the period of the Assyrian supremacy over Babylonia. They existed in great numbers in Babylonia, and were only awaiting the day when they should be able to produce the man strong enough to seize or to create a favorable opportunity, as Merodach-baladan

had done, by which they might again rule. Of the Chaldean communities which had not been absorbed by the Babylonians the kingdom or principality of the Sea Lands was at this time still the largest and strongest. North of it were a number of Chaldean tribes, among which Bit-Silani, Bit-Sa'alli, and Bit-Sala had long been the most prominent, for their names find mention in the inscriptions of Tiglathpileser III. Indeed, were it not for his records and the Annals of the later Assyrian kings, we should know even less than we do of the Chaldeans. The Babylonian inscriptions, devoted to temples, palaces, and canals, ignore their very existence, and when they came to dominion themselves they acted in all things as Babylonians. Above these tribes going northward were the communities of Bit-Amukkani, out of which came Ukin-zer, and of Bit-Adini, which lay just south of the city of Babylon. Even here the line of Chaldean communities did not cease, for the tribe of the Bit-Dakkuri was established north of the great capital city. These Chaldean communities, though they were Semites, were, nevertheless, alien communities. They did not, as a rule, intermingle readily with the Babylonians, or they would all long since have been absorbed. Though settled in a land which had been tilled for many centuries, they still remained half-nomads. The land was not overpopulated, and if they had desired to settle down as quiet and peaceable agriculturists, there would have been plenty of room

for them. They did not accept this opportunity, but over and over again had been disturbers of the peace, eager to gain the complete control, and desirous not of making a destiny for themselves, but wishing to rob the Babylonians of that which the industry of ages had accumulated by slow and painful steps. In the attainment of this purpose they had been defeated before by the Assyrians. There was now a larger hope, for Assyrian vitality was gone and the whole vast empire was falling to pieces. As has already been said, Babylonian vitality was also at the lowest ebb, and could offer no effectual resistance to any sharp blow delivered by a strong arm. But, though the Chaldeans must have known of the evident decay of Assyria, they were too wily to rise again in rebellion at an inopportune time. They could not be sure that Asshurbanapal did not possess resources which might be directed against them with crushing force, and they well knew that no movement of his was tempered with mercy.

When Asshurbanapal died the time had come to make a fresh attempt for Chaldean independence of Assyria and Chaldean dominance over Babylonia. Immediately after the death of Asshurbanapal we find Nabopolassar (Nabu-aplu-usur) king of Babylon. We do not know what his origin was. It has been supposed that he might be a son of Kandalanu; and this supposition would explain the readiness and quickness with which he secured the throne. There is, however, not a

shadow of evidence for the view. If it were the case, it would certainly seem natural for him to have spoken of his royal origin in one or the other of the few inscriptions¹ which have come down to us. On the other hand, it is not possible to prove that he was either of pure Babylonian or of Chaldean origin. The kingdom which he founded was, however, plainly Chaldean. The king's supporters were Chaldeans, and as the years went on the Babylonian influence quite gave way to Chaldean, so that the Babylonians may be considered as also losing their historic identity when Nineveh fell. The change of rulers from Asshurbanapal to Nabopolassar was momentous in consequences. With that change the headship of Assyria over the Semitic peoples of Asia came to an end forever, and leadership among them passed to the Chaldeans, whose Semitic blood was probably almost, if not quite, as pure as that of the Assyrians. They had apparently not suffered so great an intermixture with other peoples as had the Babylonians. With this change of rulers there was founded not merely a new

¹ His inscriptions, dealing almost exclusively with building operations, give unsatisfactory views of the political and military history. The chief texts are the following: (a) *The Merodach-Temple Inscription*, published and translated by Strassmaier, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, iv, 106, ff., and also translated by Winckler, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, iii, part 2, pp. 2-7. (b) *The Sippar-Canal Inscription*, published by Winckler, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, ii, 69, ff., and translated by him in *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, iii, part 2, pp. 6-9. (c) *The Belit-Temple Inscription*, published by Winckler, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, ii, 145, 172, and translated by him, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, iii, part 2, pp. 8, 9.

dynasty, but also a new kingdom. It is indeed possible to consider this new monarchy as a re-establishment of the old Babylonian empire, but it is more in accordance with the facts to look on it as a new Chaldean empire succeeding to the wealth and position of the ancient Babylonian empire. As the monarchy which he founded was so plainly Chaldean, it lies near to the other facts to consider Nabopolassar himself a Chaldean. This view is not inconsistent with the fragmentary and unsatisfactory allusions of Abydenus, who represents Nabopolassar as a general in the army of Sarakos¹ (Sin-shar-ishkun), which is probably only a form of saying that Nabopolassar was as king of Babylon subject to the suzerainty of Assyria—the Babylonian king hence occupying a place subordinate to the Assyrian.

In this account of Abydenus, which may perhaps rest on some good Babylonian source, we have a probable hint as to the manner in which the new empire was founded. Nabopolassar gained the throne with Chaldean assistance, and at first was willing to hold his rule under the nominal overlordship of Assyria. This he might do while still nourishing the hope that he might speedily be able to cast off altogether the suzerainty of Assyria. We have, however, no Chaldean or Babylonian documents which give any account

¹ According to Abydenus (Fragment 7, in Müller-Didot, *Fragmenta Hist. Græc.*, iv, p. 282), Saracos (that is, Sin-shar-ishkun) sent Bussalossoros (that is, Nabopolassar) to defend Chaldea.

of the foundation of the new kingdom, though in one text Nabopolassar calls himself the “one who laid the foundation of the land.”

We have only three historical inscriptions of the reign of Nabopolassar, and these, after the manner of Babylonian inscriptions almost from the very beginning, are devoted only to the works of peace—to building and repairing. In the first of the inscriptions¹ he describes in the usual way the rebuilding of a great Marduk temple in Babylon, which was in a ruinous condition. In this inscription he does not call himself king of Babylon, but *shakkanak*, as though he would not yet claim to be wholly free from Assyrian influence, nor be above the holding of a title more or less subordinate, though he does call himself king of Sumer and Accad. In the second² of three inscriptions he adopts the title of king of Babylon, and we are therefore safe in the supposition that this text belongs to a somewhat later period, when all semblance of dependence upon Assyria had been thrown off and Nabopolassar was king indeed in his own right and by sufferance of his people. In this inscription he records the construction of a canal at Sippar. The Euphrates had made a new course away from the city, and the king now built a canal by which the water was again to be brought to

¹ Published by Strassmaier, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, iv, pp. 106–113, 129–136. Translated also by Winckler, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, iii, part 2, pp. 3–7.

² Published by Winckler, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, ii, pp. 69–75, and translated by him, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, iii, part 2, pp. 7–9.

the city walls. In this construction of a canal Nabopolassar was following the ancient precedents of Babylonian kings from the days of Hammurabi onward. In the third of these inscriptions¹ he is called both king of Babylon and king of Sumer and Accad, and in it he gives an account of the rebuilding of a temple of Belit at Sippar. The reign of Nabopolassar was not so peaceful as these fragments might seem to indicate. He was not so absorbed in the building of temples and canals during the whole of his reign. He had indeed a delicate and difficult game of politics to play, in order that he should not be wheedled out of his gains by the quick-witted Assyrians, nor unseated from the tottering throne by a crafty prince of some Chaldean tribe. He had also to fight a severe fight against Egypt in order to save the borders of his empire.

Egypt had now again become one of the world's chief powers. The methods pursued by Psammetichus I by which he had carried Egypt to a position almost as lofty as that occupied in the glorious days of Thutmosis III and Rameses II were carried still further by his son and successor, Necho II. But a short time had elapsed since Egypt was governed by Assyrians, but now the Egyptians began to hope to participate in the division of Assyrian plunder which must soon come. In 609 it was already plain to Necho that Assyria

¹ Published by Winckler, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, ii, pp. 144-147, 172, and translated by him, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, iii, part 2, p. 9.

could endure but a short time. We must often remind ourselves that the flight of news from kingdom to kingdom or from land to land was exceedingly rapid in the ancient Orient. Kingdoms were not separated by miles of territory over which no sound was heard, and across which no rumor came flying on the wings of the wind. Necho knew of the sorry plight of the last Assyrian king. This was surely his opportunity to regain not merely all Palestine and Assyria, but even perhaps the great plains to the Euphrates which had once been Hittite. In 609, or perhaps in 608, he left Egypt, with an army, determined to press on to Assyria to participate in the first distribution of booty, confident that on his return he could readily reduce to subjection any Syrian or Palestinian prince who might think it safe to rebel against possible Egyptian tyranny, when relieved of the long-time oppression of Assyria.

Necho marched by land, and the city of Gaza, which was first approached, offered some resistance. It was, however, speedily taken, and Necho went on. No further opposition was made to his advance until he turned from the coast into the plain of Esdraelon. Nineveh had not yet fallen, but it was long since the great city had disturbed the west. The Syrophenician cities were, and had been, practically independent. They were, however, too dispirited to offer battle to any new conqueror who appeared, hoping to suffer less through oppression when they blindly yielded than they

would through a hopeless resistance. Alone had the kingdom of Judah the courage to dare a resistance. Judah had enjoyed the period of peaceful independence too much to think of falling lightly into a new condition of servitude. Josiah was king, and in him an intense national spirit ruled. He had severed the ties which bound Judah to neighboring nations in their religion, and his proclamation of Deuteronomy had widened the breach. He would dare to attack Necho if no others had the courage.¹ We do not know exactly his course from Jerusalem, but the place of the battle would seem to indicate that he intended to attack the flank or rear of Necho's army, which was moving northward and had passed by Judah. The two armies met at Megiddo, a place glorious in the annals of Egypt, for there, nearly a thousand years before, Thutmosis III had conquered the combined forces of the Syrophenician states. Necho was victorious, and Josiah fell upon the field.² The army of Judah returned in terror to Jerusalem, and made Jehoahaz, younger son of Josiah, king, apparently passing over the elder son, Eliakim, because he was disposed to submit to Necho. After the battle of Megiddo, Necho

¹ The chronicler (2 Chron. xxxv, 20-22) has preserved an interesting reminiscence of Necho's intercourse with Josiah: Necho "sent ambassadors to him [Josiah], saying, What have I to do with thee, thou king of Judah? *I come* not against thee this day, but against the house wherewith I have war; and God hath commanded me to make haste: forbear thee from *meddling with* God, who is with me, that he destroy thee not."

² 2 Kings xxiii, 29. Herodotus, ii, clix, refers to a defeat of the Syrians at Magdolus, undoubtedly the same event. But see Benzinger and Kittel.

went on northward, meeting with no further opposition, and halted at Riblah, in Cœle-Syria. Here he thought over the appointment of Jehoahaz as king of Judah, and was dissatisfied with the choice. He now considered himself the real master of Judah, after the victory at Megiddo, and ordered Jehoahaz to come to Riblah, where he was cast into chains, while his brother Eliakim was made king in his stead, under the name Jehoiakim. Upon Judah was laid a fine of one talent of gold and one hundred talents of silver, which Jehoiakim managed to pay. Jehoahaz was taken to Egypt, where he soon afterward died. Necho II was now absolute master of all the Syro-phœnician states and of the erstwhile provinces of Assyria as far as the Euphrates.

While Necho II was stripping from Assyria the western provinces, and Nabopolassar was adding to his new empire the portion of northern Babylonia which Sin-shar-ishkun had previously held, the Manda took the city of Nineveh.¹ In one mighty crash the great empire fell in fragments, and for a time Nabopolassar was busy in securing complete control of the Babylonian and Mesopotamian territory which had fallen into his hands. Necho II, assured of the possession of Palestine and Syria, had returned to Egypt with the captive Jehoahaz. He determined, however, to again go to the north and east to see if he could extend his borders beyond the Euphrates into the

¹ See above, p. 292

northern parts of Mesopotamia, which had now fallen to Nabopolassar.

From Egypt he led out an immense army, greater than any put in the field for a long time. Besides the native troops he had bodies of Libyans, Ethiopians, and other allies. He reached Carchemish, on the Euphrates, without opposition, and was probably about to cross the river when he was met by a Chaldean army. Nabopolassar was in failing health, and unable to leave his capital, but aware of the danger which confronted his empire, had despatched his son, Nebuchadrezzar, with a large army. Nebuchadrezzar gave battle at Carchemish, and won a crushing victory.¹ The Egyptians fled in confusion, and did not dare to make a stand until they had reached Egypt. Nebuchadrezzar pursued, and not one of the Syrophenician states raised an arm against him. He did not cross the territory of Judah, but passed round by the sea-coast and reached Pelusium unopposed. Jerusalem was in terror lest he should attack it, and all Egypt was in an agony of fear. The slaughter of Carchemish had undone Necho, and there was no heart in Egypt to face Nebuchadrezzar in battle. In those hours the fate of Egypt wavered in the balance. If Nebuchadrezzar went on over the Egyptian border, there was every probability that Egypt would be as easily overrun as it had been by Esarhaddon. He had won Syria and Palestine for the new Chaldean empire after but a very short

¹ Jer. xlvi, 2; comp. also 2 Kings xxiv, 7.

Egyptian régime. If he could now win Egypt, the Chaldean empire would have become in twenty years of history the world's chief power. At this juncture he was suddenly apprised of the death at Babylon of his father, Nabopolassar. He was compelled to drop all designs on Egypt and return with speed to his capital, to receive the government. No man could prophesy what might happen in the transfer of the crown in times so troublous. An outbreak of rebellion might easily occur, and another seize the throne before the rightful heir could appear.

The reign of Nabopolassar had been important in its achievements. He had wrought much for the wealth and advantage of his land by canals and by great buildings. He had been successful in diplomacy, for his winning of the Manda to his aid had not been attended by any unfortunate results. He had in war, both in his own person and in the victories of his son, reached a wonderful success, by which in twenty years he had built an empire of colossal proportions around the small territory which he had alone possessed in the beginning. It may easily be said that the greatness of this work is diminished by the undoubted fact that the time for it was ripe. Assyria was weak at just the moment when Nabopolassar was ready to begin empire building. Had he become king of Babylon a little earlier, he would not so readily have made an empire; of this there can be no doubt. But while the opportunity was at hand,

there was no less a signal display of ability in its seizing. The name of Nabopolassar must be added to the list of the greatest kings who had ruled in Babylonia. The new Chaldean empire had begun well. If now he were able to hand over to a son or heir the power which he had seized so suddenly, there was hope for a brilliant future. The son was ready, a son as great as his father in plan, and even greater in action.

CHAPTER II.

THE REIGN OF NEBUCHADREZZAR.

WHEN Nebuchadrezzar stood at the borders of Egypt and a messenger advised him of his father's death in far-away Babylonia, a crisis had come in the history of a new empire. But for that death Nebuchadrezzar would almost certainly have added Egypt to his laurels, and that were a thrilling possibility. But a danger fully as stirring lay also before him. If he had failed to reach Babylonia before the discordant elements in the new world empire were able to gather unity and force, all that his father had built might readily be destroyed. The day cried for a man of decision and of quick movement.

Nebuchadrezzar reached Babylon from the borders of Egypt in season to prevent any outbreak in favor of a usurper, if any such were intended. He was received as king of Babylon without a sign of any trouble. So began one of the longest and most brilliant reigns (604–562 B. C.) of human history. Nebuchadrezzar has not left the world without written witnesses of his great deeds. In his inscriptions, however, he follows the common Babylonian custom of omitting all reference to wars, sieges, campaigns, and battles. Only in a very

few instances is there a single reference to any of these. The great burden of all the inscriptions is building. In Babylon was centered his chief pride, and of temples and palaces, and not of battles and sieges, were his boasts. As we are therefore deprived of first-hand information from Babylonian or Chaldean sources, we are forced to turn elsewhere for information of the achievements of Nebuchadrezzar as an organizer of armies and a planner and conductor of campaigns. The knowledge thus obtained from other peoples is fragmentary, because each writer was more concerned about his own people than about the Chaldeans. The best help of this kind is obtained from the Hebrews, with whom Nebuchadrezzar had the first difficulties of his reign, and against whom his first operations were directed.

Jehoiakim, king of Judah, had paid his tribute regularly for three years¹ after Nebuchadrezzar left Palestine on his hasty journey to Babylon to assume the throne. He was, however, harassed by a patriotic party determined to compel him to throw off the Chaldean yoke. The only clear voice raised against such stupendous folly was that of Jeremiah, who, like Isaiah in a similar crisis, warned the nation against its suicidal folly. But the more Jeremiah denounced the greater his unpopularity and the more certain the triumph of the popular party. At last Jehoiakim omitted the payment of the tribute, and the issue was fairly

¹ 2 Kings xxiv, 1.

joined. Nebuchadrezzar did not invade the land at once, either because he held the rebellion in contempt and supposed it would be easily overcome, or because he was still too greatly absorbed in duties at home. His first move was to encourage Judah's neighbors to ravage the country in connection with Chaldean guerrilla bands. The Syrians, Moabites, and Ammonites were very willing to join in such attacks on their old enemy. This haphazard warfare, however, came to nothing, and Nebuchadrezzar was compelled to more strenuous measures. In 597 he dispatched an army to besiege Jerusalem, and soon after its appearance before the walls he arrived to take charge of it in person. With such forces as he could muster there could be no doubt of the ultimate issue, but Jehoiakin was spared the sight of his country's ruin, by a sudden death. His successor, a lad of eighteen years of age, Jehoiachin, known also as Jeconiah,¹ inherited only trouble, and saw himself hemmed in by a force which must soon carry the city by storming or by starvation. Jehoiachin, realizing the hopelessness of the situation, and perhaps relying somewhat on the mercy of his conqueror, decided to surrender before an active assault should be undertaken. He was compelled to appear at Nebuchadrezzar's headquarters, with his mother and his entire court, to be carried into captivity. Besides this Nebuchadrezzar demanded the surren-

¹The name occurs in three forms; see 2 Kings xxiv, 8; Jer. xxii, 24; xxiv, 1; xxvii, 20; Ezek. i, 2.

der of seven thousand men capable of bearing arms, and one thousand workers in iron. These with their families were carried away to Babylonia, where they were settled in one great block by the river Chebar, a canal near Nippur.¹ In the place of Jehoiachin, Mattaniah, another son of Josiah, was made king, under the name of Zedekiah.² He was but twenty-one years of age, and was probably considered by Nebuchadrezzar a man who could safely be trusted to rule over the remnant of the people who were suffered to remain when the better part of the inhabitants had been carried away. The choice was unfortunate, viewed from any point. Zedekiah was morally incapable of faithfulness to the Babylonians, and that, if for nothing else, because he was too weak to resist popular clamor and a mad patriotism. He was not wise enough to make himself and his state leaders in the counsels of the Syrophenician states, nor strong enough to make any concert that might be reached a power in troublous times. The policy he embraced was alike fatal to all who joined in it. It was, however, apparently not of his own devising. He fell a prey to other schemers bent on their own purposes. The real wellspring of the movements now to be described is to be found in Egypt.

¹ *Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania*, ix, plate 50, No. 84, line 2. The text here cited finally disposes of the question of the location of the Chebar.

² 2 Kings xxiv, 17; Jer. xxxvii, 1.

Necho had failed in his great plans, large enough though they were to do credit to his imagination. His reign was over, and in his room was Hophra (Apries). Soon after his accession (589) he determined to try to save for Egypt some of the fragments of Necho's great dreams. There was no chance whatever that he might get possession of any of the closer linked portions of the old Assyrian empire. These were all irrevocably possessed by others. The new Chaldean power now regnant in Babylon had shown its power too strongly in conquest to be weak in defense. But there were Syria and Palestine; they had been Egypt's during many a long day; why should they not be restored? It was worth the attempt, and the method of its undertaking might easily be copied from Necho. Hophra simply roused these states to a concerted rebellion against Nebuchadrezzar, and this was very probably accomplished by secret agents. It has been seen in former pages that these Syrophenician states had blunderingly missed many a good opportunity for opposing the progress of Assyrian conquest in earlier days; and it has been equally clear that they were no less unfortunate in choosing for their uprisings many a moment most unsuitable. In this latter they now again erred. What moment less auspicious for a rebellion could they have chosen than this, in which Egypt again spurred them on? Nebuchadrezzar had already been in Palestine. He and his armies knew the way

thither. He was surely established on his father's throne, and had no fear of civil disturbances in his own kingdom. His power and his severity were known abroad, and there was scant chance of any large uprising in the lands of the upper Euphrates. The hour was ill chosen, but Egypt had chosen it and men were found in the foolish states to follow Egypt's lead. In spite of its sore sufferings Judah was still of weight and importance, but Egypt did not approach it directly. The aid of others was first secured, and these were sent to rouse Judah to revolt.

Our first knowledge of all these movements is derived from Hebrew sources, and especially from the book of the prophet Jeremiah, himself an actor of commanding stature in the whole sad drama. From his book it appears that the states first planning to revolt were Edom, Moab, Ammon, Tyre, and Sidon.¹ They had already determined upon revolt, and had gone far enough in their preliminaries to have joined in a deliberate unity before Judah was approached at all. Whether this long delay in asking the cooperation of Judah indicates that this state was now counted of little or of great moment does not appear. The delay would admit of either interpretation. At last came an embassy to Judah, in which all had

¹ Jer. xxvii, 1-3. This chapter begins in the Massoretic text, "In the beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim the son of Josiah." It is, however, clear from verses 2, 12, and 20 that the text is corrupt. We must either read Zedekiah instead of Jehoiakim, or, as is much better, omit the verse altogether, as the LXX have done. See Giesebrécht on the passage.

united, to persuade Zedekiah to join in a rebellion against Nebuchadrezzar. This embassy found a situation not altogether to its satisfaction. It found, however, very much that was exactly ready for its labors. Jerusalem had, of course, a strong and numerous patriotic party that hated the very name of Babylonian, and believed that the destiny of the Hebrew people must carry them free of any allegiance to any such power. This party had no vision for the signs of the times, no memory for the events of the last few years, and plainly not even the slightest glimpse into the future. Its only idea was that Jehovah was with the Hebrews, no matter what their devotion to him might be.¹ He had, indeed, suffered the Babylonian to lay a heavy hand upon his people, and many had gone into captivity. But Jehovah's temple still stood in Jerusalem, and there his presence still was. The superstitious trust of their ancestors in the presence of the ark in battle at Aphek² was not greater than their present belief in Jehovah, even when his true prophets spoke all the other way. This party had the ears of all Jerusalem. It was ever shouting patriotism. Public opinion seemed all with it, and always with it, when the embassy came to urge another struggle against the new power. But there was another

¹ The character of this blind faith is shown in Jeremiah's taunt uttered afterward: "Where now are your prophets which prophesied unto you, saying, The king of Babylon shall not come against you, nor against this land?" Jer. xxxvii, 19.

² 1 Sam. iv, 1-11.

force in the city, not represented, perhaps, in so many followers, but potent yet, and with all the moral support of recognized wisdom.

Jeremiah, prophet and statesman, took the unpopular side, and advocated a policy of unvarying yielding to Babylonia. In words weighty of prescience he urged the people of Jerusalem to accept the inevitable as of God's doing, and to put their necks submissively under the yoke which he had imposed upon them. This advice, once decisively taken, would certainly have postponed the destruction to which Judah was madly hastening, if it did not save the monuments of Judah's greatness from the ruthless hand of the destroyer of that age. But it was not decisively taken. It was, indeed, too influential to be wholly disregarded, and the embassy went away without a decisive word of adhesion to its mad plans. But Jeremiah could not control the enraged populace. The air was full of rebellion, of recrimination, of false patriotism. Even the exiles in Babylonia joined in the excited bandying of words.¹ The hour was a bad one for a wise and cautious man. Jeremiah soon lost control; the king was weak, and could not hold in check the populace which thirsted in foolhardiness for a chance at its oppressors. Soon it became clear that Egypt was to be relied upon for help in the effort. The very name of Egypt was a word to conjure with, and its greatness seemed even yet to fill the whole

¹ Jer. xxvii, xxix.

earth. Rebellion was declared ; and now the end had almost come for liberty in the west land. The new rebellion seemed to Nebuchadrezzar a matter of small moment. He did not come at once in person, but sent an army, which appeared before the walls of Jerusalem in 587. The city was so situated and so defended by walls that its reduction was no easy task. To carry it by assault was quite impossible, and Nebuchadrezzar, as Titus in later days, determined to surround the walls and starve it into submission. The sight of the Babylonian forces drawing a tight cord about the city walls might have been expected to strike sudden terror into the hearts of the war party which had driven the nation to this pass. In this the expected did not happen. The people of Jerusalem were mad in their folly, but they were not cowards, and they began a vigorous resistance to the great king. The walls of Jerusalem were strong enough to afford defense for a long time, and Nebuchadrezzar was not provided in the beginning with artillery strong enough to break them down and so take the city by assault. It could apparently be taken only by a siege in which famine should aid force.

There was terror in the city, but determination, and the spirit was admirable, when the odds are considered, even at so great a distance from the events as this. It was probably chiefly the hope of help from Egypt that strengthened the hearts and hands of the besieged. This help was not to

fail utterly, for while the siege was yet in its early progress the army of Pharaoh Hophra entered Palestine, with the direct purpose of offering help to the besieged, and of so raising the siege, and of ultimately driving back the Babylonians. This was partly accomplished. The Babylonian army withdrew from the gates and went southward to meet the new and formidable foe. What a reaction of joy was produced by this sudden reversal of fortune will perhaps never be fully known. The party that had brought on the war must have felt that its hour of justification had fully come. The false prophets, as Jeremiah had stigmatized them, who had prophesied that in a short time the Chaldean power would come to a sudden and violent end, must have pointed to the withdrawing hosts as the first sign of the impending fulfillment of their predictions. Amid all this rejoicing Jeremiah alone maintained his serenity of mind and his clearness of vision. He could not deny that a change had indeed come; that was plain to any eye, but it was only temporary. Amid jubilations his word sounds solemn and disquieting: "Thus saith the Lord: Deceive not yourselves, saying, The Chaldeans shall surely depart from us: for they shall not depart. For though ye had smitten the whole army of the Chaldeans that fight against you, and there remained but wounded men among them, yet should they rise up every man in his tent, and burn this city with fire."¹ To those

¹ Jer. xxxvii, 9, 10.

who trusted in Hophra his word was no less definite: "Behold, Pharaoh's army, which is come forth to help you, shall return to Egypt into their own land. And the Chaldeans shall come again, and fight against this city; and they shall take it, and burn it with fire."¹ It could not be expected that a message of that tenor in an hour of apparent triumph and of real hope would be welcomed. It was, of course, not believed. Every indication of the hour was against faith in it. Hatred of Jeremiah and doubt of his loyalty grew apace. He essayed to leave the city to care for his property in Benjamin. It was at once suspected that he intended to desert to the foe, and give his aid and counsel to the Chaldeans. He was therefore apprehended and thrown into prison, there to await the ruin which he had foreseen.²

Such were the scenes of joy and the emotions of doubt which had sway in the city. What were the opinions of the Babylonians we have scant means for judging. It is not improbable that they counted the taking of Jerusalem as a matter of importance to their newly founded empire. The history of Assyria was not wholly unknown to these new agitators, and they must have understood how troublesome a thorn Jerusalem had been in the western side of the empire of the Sargonides. They now wished to end this difficulty

¹ Jer. xxxvii, 7, 8.

² Jer. xxxvii, 11-15.

at the beginning of their own plans. But they seem not to have thought highly of the prowess in war of the nations of Syria. If they had estimated highly the other states of Tyre and Sidon, they would hardly have pushed by them to attack Jerusalem, while they were left free to attack the flank or rear. Furthermore, they would not have left Jerusalem itself without a guard to hold it in check and prevent an attack, while they were engaged with the Egyptians. It is a pity that the historiographers of the Chaldean empire were so completely given to the description of various buildings and restoring operations as not to have left for us an account of this campaign from their point of view. That it would ring loud with boasts of victory might be expected. Between its lines, however, could perhaps be read the real motives and the true purposes and intent of some of these movements. Without such records we may only follow the events further as the Hebrews have preserved memory of them.

The army of the Babylonians met the Egyptian army at some unknown point south of Jerusalem and drove it back to Egypt, apparently without great difficulty.¹ But it did not follow up the advantage thus gained. As affairs then were in Egypt, Nebuchadrezzar, with a good army, might have overrun the whole land, as Esarhaddon had

¹ Josephus (*Antiquities*, x, 7, § 3) declares that the Egyptians were defeated, but Jeremiah (xxxvii, 7), on whom he was doubtless leaning, says nothing of a defeat.

done before him, and have perhaps made it a part of his new empire. But, as we shall see later, Nebuchadrezzar was not in person at the head of his army ; the army was probably not large, and so great an extension of its operations, leaving states and people unconquered behind, would have been precarious. At this time the Babylonians had done all that was desired for present purposes in compelling Hophra's return to Egypt, where he was suffered to reign in peace for several years longer. He would not again endeavor to help his allies in Syria and Palestine. They would be left to their fate. Egypt was again proved a broken reed on which to lean.¹

As soon as the menace of the Egyptian army of deliverance from Jerusalem had been removed the army of beleaguers returned to the sacred city. With increased energy and determination was the siege prosecuted, but the defense continued bold and brave. Within the city there was, however, no disciplined and well-armed body of men capable of making a successful sally against the veterans whom Nebuchadrezzar had collected from many provinces. If this could have been done, and fresh supplies thus introduced, the siege might have been indefinitely prolonged. Famine² lent aid to the army of the siege, and the defense grew weaker. When the way was clear for the success-

¹ Isa. xxxvi, 6.

² Presumably pestilence likewise added to the terror of the situation. Comp. Jer. xxxviii, 2.

ful assault the Babylonian general in command ordered it, and a breach was made in the walls. On the ninth day of the fourth month (July), in the year 586, the Chaldeans, furious with delay, poured through the walls of Hezekiah into the city. Zedekiah fled at night, leaving all behind him. The courage which had sustained the siege was plainly not his; his only idea was to save himself by flight, probably into the wilds beyond Jordan, for in that direction his fleeing steps were turned, and then later, when the Babylonian army had withdrawn, to return and save something from the wreck.¹ The Babylonians were too shrewd to permit so transparent a scheme to reach fulfillment, and gave pursuit. So long as the king, lawfully so appointed, was free there was some chance of a fresh rebellion, as soon as the necessities of their growing empire should give call to the armies elsewhere. Zedekiah was overtaken in the plains of Jericho and captured.² His captors did not return him to Jerusalem, but carried him off to Riblah, in Syria, to present him before the person of Nebuchadrezzar. It now appears that Nebuchadrezzar was not present at the siege of Jerusalem at all, but retained personal command at Riblah, and very probably of a larger body of troops than was utilized in the investment of the Jewish capital. Whether the body of troops under his command

¹ The explanation of Zedekiah's purposes is due to a conjecture of Tiele, *Geschichte*, ii, 431.

² 2 Kings xxv, 4, 5.

was actively engaged against other Syrophenician states at this time is not clearly known. Nebuchadrezzar would not be likely to hold a large body of men in idleness for a long time, even if it were a military possibility. On the other hand, we have no sign in the materials now accessible to us of any great movements¹ of his while the siege of Jerusalem was in progress. That he did not attack Tyre nor Sidon until after Jerusalem was taken seems clear, and we know of no other people sufficiently strong to resist a large army, who were now in rebellion. It may therefore well be that Nebuchadrezzar with his forces had been chiefly occupied in widely extended plundering raids. So soon as Zedekiah was presented before Nebuchadrezzar the judgment was given against him. His sons were slain before his eyes, and he was then blinded—that his last sight of earth might be one of horror. It is not surprising that condign punishment should be his, when the circumstances are considered. When made king by the Chaldeans he had sworn faithfulness to them in the name of his own God, Yahwe.² He had broken that oath—the most solemn oath which could have been placed before him. But the sav-

¹ It was probably at this time that Nebuchadrezzar cut cedar beams in the Lebanon and reduced the inhabitants to subjection. See Pognon, *Les Inscriptions Babylonniennes du Wadi Brissa*, especially pp. 20–22, 120–126. Comp. also Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, i, pp. 504–506, and Maspero, *The Passing of the Empires*, New York, 1900, p. 543, footnote.

² Ezek. xvii, 11–21.

age form of his punishment is for the moment interesting. That shows a new hand in the dominion of Babylonia. Such savagery¹ would be expected in an Assyrian king. It was rather unusual in a Babylonian king, and its appearance now is in connection with a Chaldean. In that is there a showing forth of a new people. It seems a promise that the Chaldean would not be merciful, as the Babylonian had so often been in the past.

While Zedekiah was in flight the army of the Babylonians had entered the city. The breach in the walls was made in the eleventh year of his reign² (586), after a siege lasting about one and a half years. The patience of the conquerors was exhausted. They had tried before to secure a stable condition of affairs, which the people of Jerusalem had ruthlessly broken. They had spent this long period in a wearisome siege. They would now end all possibility of a future like the past by utterly destroying the offending city. It was first plundered for the enrichment of the successful army, and the gold, silver, and brass of the temple decorations, with all the vessels of its service, were removed to be dedicated to Marduk in Babylon. Nothing of value was forgotten, that

¹ Our modern judgments are not based on the same premises as the ancient. The Assyrians would undoubtedly have put Zedekiah to death after horrible torture or by mutilation. It is possible that we ought to consider this blinding to be merciful punishment, when we remember that even modern orientals do not estimate vision so highly as occidentals. Egyptian fellahin blinded themselves to avoid conscription under Mohammed Ali.

² Jer. xxxix, 2.

Yahwe might pay full tribute to the conquering Marduk. Then the torch was applied, and the temple, center of such affection and hope, became a mass of blackened ruins. Then the rich parts of the city were likewise destroyed, and its walls of defense, which had rendered such valiant service, were razed to the ground. It was an act of barbarism, like unto the oft-repeated deeds of the Assyrians and unlike the custom of the Babylonians.¹ Like the punishment of Zedekiah, this also displayed the new hand in the affairs of men—the hand of the Chaldean.

Of the population of the ruined city a large number—how large we do not know—were carried away captive to Babylonia.² The captives, as before, were chosen from the richest and best of the population. The poor,³ the weak, were left behind, and a wise and generous provision was made for them. They were to receive land for the cultivation of the vine, and were to be left to the unhindered pursuit of their religion. A descendant of the house of David, by name Gedaliah, was appointed governor,⁴ and to him the person of Jer-

¹ The Babylonians did not even share in the destruction of the hated city of Nineveh, which had so sorely punished Babylon itself in earlier days.

² It is interesting to speculate upon the number of the Judeans who were exiled in all the invasions of Nebuchadrezzar. The latest computation is by Guthe (*Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, pp. 236, 237), who reckons the total number at thirty-six thousand to forty-eight thousand, which he counts as a quarter or an eighth of the total population.

³ “But Nebuzaradan the captain of the guard left of the poorest of the land to be vinedressers and husbandmen.” Jer. lii, 16.

⁴ 2 Kings xxv, 22; Jer. xl, 5-7.

emiah was intrusted. The prophet was to be left free to go and to do as he willed, and was evidently regarded by the Chaldeans not as a Hebrew patriot, but rather as a Chaldean sympathizer. It was probably the purpose of the Chaldeans to give the land a stable government and a full opportunity for the development of its resources. Under favorable conditions it would doubtless soon be able to pay a good tribute and so add to the wealth of the empire. This purpose, however, failed of early accomplishment, for the few and feeble folk left under the rule of Gedaliah were not able to maintain any sure defense of their present position. Another descendant of the Davidic house, with the surprising name of Ishmael, plotted against Gedaliah. Ishmael found a helper in the Ammonites, who may have feared that the people of Judah would again form a strong state, and were anxious to nip the effort in the bud. Ishmael slew Gedaliah and many of his helpers,¹ and so destroyed the last hope of the national cohesion. The paltry few who now remain are in terror before Nebuchadrezzar and in fear of their neighbors. There is no hope for them in the land, and they determine to emigrate to Egypt. With them Jeremiah cast in his lot, and into another land the poor remains of a once powerful kingdom departed.²

So ended the campaign of Nebuchadrezzar

¹ Jer. xl, 13-xli, 15.

² 2 Kings xxv, 26; Jer. xli, 16-18; xlvi; xlvi, 1-7.

against Judah. The province was left stripped of its inhabitants, wasted by armies, and burned in flames. A more ruinous end of a campaign has rarely been seen in human history. Even from the Chaldean point of view the punishment of Zedekiah and of his people was greatly overdone. If the new Babylon was to become rich, it could gain wealth as the Assyrians had done, not only by plunder, but by carefully gathered annual tributes. From Judah in the state to which it was now come no tribute could be expected. From it no levies of men of war to fight for the extension of Chaldean power could be drawn. It was a wasted land, and in it a great opportunity had been lost through savage hate and perhaps through fear of future Egyptian intrigue.

In this destruction of Jerusalem and the deportation of another portion of its inhabitants is found the culmination of a long series of efforts directed against the Hebrews by the peoples of Babylonia and Assyria. From the days of Hammurabi down to this dark end again and again have Babylonian kings plundered and punished and at times administered in this land and among this people. Early in their career of conquest the Assyrian kings began the same process. For them it was reserved to blot out the northern kingdom of the Hebrews in the days of Shalmaneser and Sargon. The early Babylonians, however, never achieved a permanent victory over them. To the Chaldeans, their heirs, was this given. Wherein all his predecessors had

failed Nebuchadrezzar had succeeded. The success was lamentable, though the final issue of it all was better than this hour presaged. Many a people had been swallowed up in the advance of Assyrian and Babylonian power and forever lost. Even empires once distinguished for power and civilization had so thoroughly disappeared in the vortex as to leave scarcely a distinguishable sign of their former existence. This was not to be true in the case of Judah. The Hebrew had ideas that could not be quenched, and these carried his person into a life that would not die among men. The Chaldean had destroyed the state, but the people lived on in activity. The songs of Zion might not be sung,¹ but the words of Zion might be spoken. The Hebrew would not now pay tribute in the land of Judah, but would take tribute even of his captors as he pushed successfully forward into business in his new home. His wise leader, Jeremiah, had counseled him to make the new land his home in the fullest sense: “Build ye houses, and dwell in them; and plant gardens, and eat the fruit of them; take ye wives, and beget sons and daughters; and take wives for your sons, and give your daughters to husbands, that they may bear sons and daughters; and multiply ye there, and be not diminished. And seek the peace of the city whither I have caused you to be carried away captive, and pray unto the Lord for it: for in the peace thereof shall ye have peace.”² The advice

¹ Psa. exxxvii, 4.² Jer. xxix, 5-7.

was followed.¹ Nebuchadrezzar had gained a new factor in his composite population, though he had lost a rich province.

As soon as the war against Judah was ended Nebuchadrezzar turned his arms against Tyre. The great commercial city had joined with Sidon in the embassy which induced Judah to rebel against him.² Tyre was probably the chief sinner, after Egypt, in this whole matter. It had more at stake in its overland commerce to the east, upon which its seagoing commerce was dependent, than any of the others. Tyre would fain make another attempt to gain back the commerce of which the Assyrians had gone far to deprive it, and for which they had struggled so long. Tyre would now be brought to answer for its new attempt at rebellion. In the case of Tyre, however, Nebuchadrezzar had an entirely different problem from that which he had successfully met in Judah. Its people indeed were not more brave than the people of Jerusalem; on the contrary, their whole history would show that they were much less so. Not in person but in position did they possess a preeminence over their fellow-conspirators. Jerusalem was surrounded by hills, and, though well fortified, as its resistance showed, it was approach-

¹ The discoveries of the expedition of the University of Pennsylvania at Nippur have shown how largely Jews entered into the business life of Babylonia. See *The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania*, edited by H. V. Hilprecht, vol. ix, and compare the review by Jensen, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, xiii, pp. 329–336.

² See above, pp. 321, 322.

able on every side. Tyre, on the other hand, was founded upon the sea, and it was impossible for a land force alone to besiege it successfully. No matter how completely it was invested by land, provisions could always be introduced from the sea. The Chaldeans were no more familiar with the sea than the Assyrians or Babylonians¹ had been, and were no more able or willing to venture upon it. Nebuchadrezzar had no seaport on the Mediterranean in complete possession, from which he could send forth a fleet to besiege Tyre from the sea, and he had no fleet with which to do this even if he had had the port of departure. The issue of the attempt which Nebuchadrezzar was now to make was problematical indeed. But Tyre must be punished or his empire might be assailed again in a twelvemonth, even though Judah had been so terribly handled. In 585 Nebuchadrezzar led his army against Tyre and began a siege. It was a long and tedious enterprise. For thirteen years² the Chaldeans held on their investment (585–573) unable to take the city. Unfortunately there is no account of this siege in

¹ It is not intended to assert that the Babylonians had no ships, but simply that they were not *seamen*. Herodotus (i, 194) and Sennacherib (Taylor Cylinder, col. iii, lines 55, 56, *Records of the Past*, New Series, vi, p. 92) witness to their possession and use of ships. The English versions of Isa. xliii, 14, “the Chaldeans, whose ery is in the ships” (A. V.), and “the Chaldeans, in the ships of their rejoicing” (R. V.), give a totally false impression, if they seem to make the Chaldeans a seafaring folk, for so the passage is often quoted. The text is quite likely corrupt. See Cheyne and especially Marti (*Das Buch Jesaja*, p. 297) on the passage.

² Josephus, *Arch.*, xi, 11, 1, and *Con. Ap.*, i, 2, 1.

any of Nebuchadrezzar's own inscriptions, and we must gain such insight into the affair as is possible from the fragmentary pieces of information at second or third hand which have come down from other sources.¹ From these it is quite clear that the city was not taken by the Babylonians at all. An end to the long contest was finally made by a capitulation similar to those which Tyre had made before in the case of the Assyrians. The people of Tyre were not careful for national pride. They desired most of all to be let alone, for the continuing of their peaceful pursuit of trade. Ethobal II was now king of Tyre, and he was willing to make terms with Nebuchadrezzar, which involved, probably, the payment of a tribute, and little more.² Ethobal continued to rule his city under a sort of Assyrian tutelage. Tyre was not given to the sword, burned, or plundered, and Nebuchadrezzar had but little to pride himself upon in this campaign, years of time though it had cost.

While the siege of Tyre still dragged its weary length along Nebuchadrezzar began another and even more important undertaking, and this against Egypt. It was Egypt which had caused all this loss of time and men and treasure to Nebuchad-

¹ Comp. Tiele, *Geschichte*, ii, p. 433, n. In a contract tablet dated in Tyre "month Tammuz, day 22d, year 40th Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon," there is evidence of Babylonian supremacy over Tyre. See *Records of the Past*, New Series, iv, pp. 99-100, and Sayee in *Expository Times*, June, 1899, p. 430. Nothing can be made out of Eusebius, *Chron.*, i, 51; Justin, xviii, 3; and Strabo, xv, 1, 6.

² Menander, Frag. 2, in Müller-Didot, *Frag. Hist. Graec.*, iv, p. 447.

rezzar. So long as Egypt was suffered to remain as it was, or permitted to increase in power, so long would Palestine and Syria remain open to sudden raid or to slow-maturing intrigue. Egypt must be punished for past intrigues, for the army sent to help Zedekiah, and must at the same time be deprived of the power of making any similar trouble for some time to come.

Nebuchadrezzar had driven Hophra and his army back into Egypt, but he did not pursue, as we have already seen, his advantage any further at this time. Whether he made any further assaults between that event and the thirty-seventh year of his reign is not known to us, as our sources of information are silent on the matter. Whether he did or did not Egypt remained quiet until his time for retribution had come. In 567 Nebuchadrezzar invaded Egypt, determined to make an end of its meddling in Syria. He had opportunely chosen the moment of his campaign. Hophra had suffered a terrible defeat in Libya, out of which had come dynastic difficulties.¹ He had even been compelled to associate on the throne with himself as coregent Amasis, as a representative of the national Egyptian party. After a defeat in arms against another power, and after some sort of civil strife in which the land received a second king, Egypt was in nowise prepared for the invasion. Nebuchadrezzar met with no serious opposition at the borders, and pressed into the heart of the Nile

¹ Herodotus, iv, cl-clxi.

valley. How far he penetrated into the country is entirely unknown to us. The Chaldeans appear to have had a tradition¹ that he turned Egypt into a Babylonian province, after he had conquered Amasis. We have, however, no definite information which would lead us to believe that he wrought so great a revolution. To repeat the Assyrian exploit of Esarhaddon was hardly to be expected of Nebuchadrezzar.

He had undoubtedly plundered largely, and was now ready to return laden with booty. He had further shown his power to the people of Egypt, as he went unopposed along the whole course of their former possessions in Syria, and they would not be easily led into a violation of his territory. Nebuchadrezzar attempted nothing more in Egypt.² He did not go on to make it a part of his empire, as Esarhaddon had done, nor does he appear to have in any way interfered with the native rulers. If his reign had continued longer, it is altogether probable that Egypt would have again been the scene of his operations, to plunder and perhaps attempt to rule.

The campaign against Egypt was probably the last which Nebuchadrezzar undertook against any people. The attempt has been made to show that he also made a campaign against Elam. This is based only upon the passage in Jeremiah's proph-

¹ Josephus, *Ant. Jud.*, x, 9, § 7; 11, § 1. The authority for the view of Josephus was Berossos, but we do not know how much Berossos may have suffered in the process of transmission.

ecies¹ in which he predicts a day of wrath and destruction for this people. He does not, however, mention the name of the king who was to accomplish this punishment of Elam. There is not known to us any reason which should have induced Nebuchadrezzar to undertake such a campaign, neither do we find a chronological position for it in his reign. It is, from present knowledge, improbable that he did make war against his neighbor.

The campaigns of Nebuchadrezzar appear few and small as we look at them in comparison with those of Tiglathpileser III, Sargon, and Esarhadon. Other campaigns, yet unknown to us, he probably waged, for he could otherwise hardly have held and extended the empire of Nabopolassar. But whether he waged others or not, his title to rank among the greatest warriors who ever ruled in Babylonia or Assyria can hardly be denied. His exploits are not so well known; his own inscriptions have not spread them before us in such elaboration of detail as did those of former kings, and this absence of a fully rounded picture makes them seem less important than they really are. If judged not only by what we know of them, but also by the results which we can see did actually accrue from them, they must be ranked high indeed. He accomplished by force of arms the complete pacification of the long-troubled Syro-phœnician states—a pacification that long contin-

¹ Jer. xlix, 34-38. As to the question of the interpolation of this passage see Giesebrécht.

ued even though his hand was removed. He carried war into the land of Egypt, and that when the land was not weak, as it once had been, but immediately after a great increase of strength. He defeated and drove back in confusion two great Egyptian kings, first Necho II and then Hophra. He began the work of consolidating a vast new empire, and carried it to brilliant success by sheer force of despotic power. There were no civil wars and no further rebellion, because none dared raise a head or hand against a personal power like his.

Yet great though Nebuchadrezzar was in the organization and the use of an army, great in the choice of commanders and in their employment, he bases all his claim to posterity's honor not upon war and its glories, but upon the quiet acts of peace. His long and elaborately written inscriptions¹ have only a boastful line or two of conquest,

¹ The chief inscriptions of Nebuchadrezzar are the following: (a) The East India House Inscription, I R. 53–64, translated into English by Ball, *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, x, pp. 87–129, and into German by Winckler, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, iii, part 2, pp. 10–31. (b) The Philipps (or Grotfend) Cylinder, I R. 65, 66, translated into English by Ball, *op. cit.*, pp. 215–230, and into German by Winckler, *op. cit.*, pp. 32–39. (c) Inscription describing wall constructions at Babylon and Borsippa, V R. 34, with corrections by Winckler, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, ii, pp. 142, 144, translated by Winckler, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, iii, part 2, pp. 38–45. (d) Inscription describing various building operations, published in Abel-Winckler, *Keilschrifttexte*, pp. 33–38, and translated by Ball, *op. cit.*, pp. 358–368, and by Winckler, *op. cit.*, pp. 46–53. (e) The Borsippa Inscription, I R. 51, No. 1, translated by Winckler, *op. cit.*, pp. 52–55. (f) Wall Inscription, I R. 52, No. 3, translated by Winckler, *op. cit.*, pp. 54–59. (g) Larsa Inscription, I R. 51, No. 2, translated by Winckler, *op. cit.*, pp. 58–61. (h) The Inscriptions of Wady Brissa, published and translated into French in Pognon, *Les Inscriptions Babyloniques du Wadi Brissa*.

while their long periods are heavy with the descriptions of extraordinary building operations. From his father he may have inherited this inclination, if not skill in its accomplishment. When he ascended the throne Babylon was already showing the result of Nabopolassar's building, but it must have looked almost a ruin in its very incompleteness. The great works which Nabopolassar had undertaken were in considerable part left unfinished. To these Nebuchadrezzar first addressed his labors. The chief of them all were the walls of Babylon, which Nabopolassar had intended to rebuild, and at the same time to enlarge. He had perhaps accomplished about two thirds of his plans when the work was left to his greater son. The inner wall of Babylon, the Imgur-Bel, was completely finished, and the outer wall, the Nimmitti-Bel, likewise, their thickness being increased and the ditches which belonged to them being lined with brick. In connection with this he reconstructed the great city gates, which were not of solid metal, but were of cedar wood covered with strips of decorated bronze. At the thresholds he set up bronze colossi, probably of the usual half-human, half-animal form. For the age in which these walls were built they were probably almost

(j) The Canal Inscription, I R. 52, No. 4, translated by Winckler, *op. cit.*, pp. 60, 61. In addition to these several minor inscriptions are enumerated in Bezold, *Kurzgefasster Ueberblick*, and are also translated by Winckler, *op. cit.*, pp. 60-71. See further, David W. McGee, "Zur Topographie Babylons auf Grund der Urkunden Nabopolassars und Nebukadnezars," *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, iii, 524-560.

impregnable, for they far exceeded the walls of Jerusalem and of Tyre, which had so well resisted Nebuchadrezzar's own assaults. But even with this result Nebuchadrezzar was far from satisfied. He would finish all that his father had planned and then go far beyond him. Not only should the inner wall be impregnable, the outer wall should be so strong that no force should ever be able to reach the inner wall, and then to cap the curious climax he would even, on some sides, make it impossible even to reach the outer wall. On the southern side the city needed no further defense, for upon it lay the land of Chaldea, loyal to incorruptibility, and strong enough to prevent any force from passing through its borders to attack the capital. It remained, therefore, only to strengthen the walls upon three sides. This was done in the following manner: Upon the east of the city, at a distance of four thousand cubits from the outer wall, he built another massive wall. Before this was a vast moat, basin-shaped, deep, and walled round with bricks like a quay. The outworks on the west were similar, but not so strong, and this was natural, for the desert formed a natural barrier. The works on the north were entirely different in construction and apparently in purpose. Between the two city walls, and between the Euphrates and the Ishtar gate, Nebuchadrezzar reared a great artificial platform of brick laid in bitumen. Upon this elevated plateau was then erected a citadel, which was connected with his royal palace.

While this construction did not act as the former in keeping a hostile army from reaching even the outer wall, it did make the outer wall at that point practically a solid construction back to the inner wall, and so made it impossible that it should be either broken down or even breached. At the same time the lofty citadel made a watchtower whence the level country for miles could be commanded, and from which a destructive shower of missiles could be rained on the heads of any attacking party.

With these works Nebuchadrezzar had made the taking of Babylon, if any defense were made within, an impossibility in that age. The compass of the walls was so vast that no single power, and perhaps scarcely a combination of powers, could hope to accomplish an investment that would reduce the city by famine; while, on the other hand, wall after wall must be broken down, under almost impossible conditions, if the city was to be taken from without by assault. The enemies of Babylon must lay their plans to gain the city, in its state of defense, only from within by treachery.¹

When the defenses were fully accomplished it was natural that Nebuchadrezzar should turn to the beautifying and increasing of the city from within. Nabopolassar had built a great street,

¹ Herodotus (i, clxxviii, clxxix) has given a most elaborate description of these defenses. As to the value of his testimony see above, vol. i, pp. 263, 264. For Nebuchadrezzar's own account see East India House Inscription, col. iv, 66-73; v, 1-65; vi, 1-55. Comp. Appendix C.

Ai-ibur-shabu, which Nebuchadrezzar now increased in height, leveled, and repaved; to this he joined a new and handsome street called Nana-sakipat-tebi-sha. The repaving of these streets, at increased elevation, made necessary two other great works. The points at which they passed through the inner and outer walls were marked by great gateways, which had now become too low. They were therefore completely torn down to water level and rebuilt in astonishing magnificence, the massive cedar doors covered with bronze plates, while before the thresholds were placed great colossi of animals and dragons. Yet another necessity was brought about by this same elevation of the street surfaces. The doors of the palace, which Nabopolassar had rebuilt, must be changed, and with this, for greater display, came the rebuilding of the entire palace. This was a work of colossal proportions, though less than that of the work upon the walls. Nebuchadrezzar is careful to state that for this reconstruction he began at the earth's surface, and laid afresh the foundations in brick and bitumen. To this he adds further the statement that he brought great cedar beams from the Lebanon for the work. That word alone suggests a comment upon the vastness of the undertaking, when one considers the distance by land from the Lebanon to the Euphrates over which these beams must in some manner be carried, and then the long rafting down the river.

From such buildings of war and of residence Nebuchadrezzar turned to temples—the homes of his gods. Upon E-sagila¹ he seems not to have expended any great labor, but he made its vast entrance doorway to shine as the sun. But the hall of the oracles, Du-azag, was decorated with gold, in the place of its former silver, while the great temple E-kua was redecorated, and this also with “red gold.” In his own story these temple works are passed over in a few lines, and here may have only a passing word, but we must not fail to make due allowance for them when imagination sets in array before us the works of this one king. To his gods Nebuchadrezzar paid a full measure of faith,² as every inscription testifies in words. To them he was not likely to give less of works when he rebuilt his imperial city. Beneath the few lines of his hasty allusion lies the great fact of immense and costly works for the praise of the gods of Babylon.

One more work was done for Babylon itself, and that a work deemed always praiseworthy in a king of Babylonia. Canal restoration was constantly necessary, and since the day when Hammurabi built his first canal at the very founding of his realm king after king had rebuilt these indispensable public works. The eastern canal of

¹ East India House Inscription, col. ii, 40–65; col. iii, 1–10, Winckler, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, iii. part 2, pp. 14, 15.

² See Rogers, “The Words of Nebuchadnezzar Concerning Himself,” *Sunday School Times*, Dec. 3, 1898, pp. 802, 803.

Babylon, by name Libil-Khigalla, had fallen into a state of ruin. The clay from its banks had slipped down into its channel until, in places at least, its very course could not be traced. Nebuchadrezzar had it redug, and then walled up from the bottom. This canal, in its rebuilding, was carried beneath the great street of Ai-ibur-shabu, and that made necessary a bridge to carry the street over the sluggish waters. It would be interesting to know the construction and the material of the bridge, but the record is silent thereon. Nebuchadrezzar himself plainly considered this canal work as worthy of especial note; to it he gave an entire inscription,¹ as he did not even to his great wall, temple, and palace erections and adornments. Babylonia was still a rainless land, and the builders of canals were its chief benefactors.

The construction of temple, palace, canal, and defenses of Babylon must have been spread over a long series of years, though perhaps little was done in regard to them until the chief of his wars were over. Had Nebuchadrezzar done nothing more for his kingdom than thus to make his capital great, powerful, and beautiful, his claim to fame in Babylonia would, from all oriental standards, have been good. It was of the very nature of oriental monarchs in the ancient world to plunder the whole kingdom that the capital might be rich and worthy. This Nebuchadrezzar

¹ This inscription is published I R. 52, No. 4, and translated by Winckler, *op. cit.*, pp. 60, 61.

had done, but he had not left undone great works for the other chief cities of his empire. Over Babylon he had watched with especial pride. He may well have felt and spoken as the Hebrew sacred book represents: "Is not this great Babylon, that I have built for the house of the kingdom, by the might of my power, and for the honor of my majesty?"¹

Over Borsippa, also, did he turn his gaze and make his boast, and to it he also gave works of reconstruction. In Borsippa the pyramidal temple of E-ur-imin-an-ki, "the house of the seven quarters of the Heavens and the Earth," had fallen into partial ruin. It had been originally intended when it was built to make it consist of seven stages from earth to its topmost pinnacle. The final stage had, however, not been added at all, according to Nebuchadrezzar's statement on the subject. That alone would have tempted the building king to a work of completion. But besides this the building was now in bad repair. The account of it which Nebuchadrezzar gives is very instructive as showing the process and the cause of decay in Babylonian constructions.² He says that the water drains were out of order, and that therefore the rains had broken down its walls, and the outer covering of burnt bricks had burst open. Though Babylonia was a rainless land in the sense that it had no regular rains of value to

¹ Dan. iv, 30.

² The Borsippa Inscription, I R. 51, No. 1, Winckler, *op. cit.*, pp. 52-55.

the husbandman, it was subject to torrential downpours of water. If this was not rapidly and completely carried off, it soaked in between the burnt facing and the unburnt filling of the walls and caused a bulging, which was liable to end in a downfall of the wall. To such pass had this building come. Nebuchadrezzar now rebuilt the structure, supplying new strength to it without taking it down to its foundations, as he had done repeatedly in other cases. When thus restored he capped it with the new story to bring it to the required symmetrical height. In like manner he rebuilt or restored the remaining temples of the city. To these works of peace he added a work of preparation for defense in war by rebuilding the walls of Borsippa on the same general scale and plan as those of Babylon.

In the reconstruction and adornment of the temples of E-sagila at Babylon and of E-zida at Borsippa Nebuchadrezzar had honored the most ancient and most venerated of all the shrines of the Babylonian people. Other temples might and did possess great renown in this or that city; these were honored wherever the name of Babylonia went, and wherever its people had joys or sorrows. In these temples the king worshiped. He had now made them worthy of the gods who had made him great. But he likewise owed debts to other gods and to the citizens of other cities. He therefore carried on restorations of temples in other cities, among which he especially enumer-

ates Sippar, Larsa, Ur, Dilbat, Baz, and Uruk.¹ On the bricks which he laid in every temple he stamped his name and royal titles, and from every ruin in Babylonia which these later days have opened and explored, however lightly, bricks have come bearing the stamp of this king. It would appear that not only in the city in which he dwelt, and in the few which he especially enumerates, but in every other city, small or great, in his own land, he had either built or restored. Like unto him in this particular no king his equal had ever reigned in Babylonia.

In the year 562 Nebuchadrezzar died. Of his last years we know nothing but continued building, and of his last days and the final cause of his death we have no Babylonian record. The story of the book of Daniel² that his great pride had a deep fall, and that his reason was lost, and that he was left to suffer of a madness which made him conceive himself a beast of the field, finds no mention in any record of his own race.³ It might well be a day of mourning in all Babylon when the

¹ See the texts enumerated above.

² Dan. iv, 31, ff.

³ Josephus has reported a similar tradition in these words: "Nebuchadrezzar falling into a state of weakness, altered his (manner of) life when he had reigned forty-three years; whereupon his son, Evil-merodach, obtained the kingdom" (*Apion*, i, 20). Eusebius also has a curious story of Nebuchadrezzar's end: "On a certain occasion the king went up to the roof of his palace, and, after prophesying of the coming of the Persian Cyrus and his conquest of Babylon, suddenly disappeared" (*Prop., ix, 41, Chron.*, i, 59). See Schrader, "Die Sage vom Wahnsinn Nebukadnezars," *Jahrb. für Prot. Theologie*, vii, pp. 629, ff., and comp. Prince, *Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, pp. 32-35.

great king died. Unto the very ends of the earth he had made the name of Babylon great.

Enough has already been said concerning his merits and success as a man of war. In taking a view of his whole personality there are to be added to this several other points of weight. His building operations were so extensive that in this particular he outranks all who preceded him, whether in Assyria or in Babylonia. For the most part these works were beneficent, though the execution of them must have cost much human life and terrible suffering of fatigue and oppression. That he added to this love for the constructively beautiful an interest in the arts and the sciences is clear enough from the books which have come down to us out of the great collections in his own and other cities. These are evidences also enough that he was a patron of letters and science, worthy to be compared with that great Assyrian founder of libraries, Asshurbanapal. A man of blood and iron it has been already sufficiently shown that he was. His punishment of Zedekiah is to be placed with the very worst instances of savagery in all that history. But it is just to remember that Zedekiah had broken an oath, and so may be considered as having offended against the great god Marduk, and that in a most vital point. Further than this there is no other instance of great cruelty known to us; and it is especially worthy of notice that we find no case of cruelty practiced solely from bloodthirstiness, and in repulsive fashions, as was

so often the case in the reigns of certain Assyrian kings like Asshurnazirpal.

To all his virtues and all his faults Nebuchadrezzar added deep piety. He was a polytheist, worshiping especially Marduk, god of the mighty temple of E-sagila in Babylon, and Nabu, god of the great temple Ezida in Borsippa. He was, however, careful to pay due homage to gods many and lords many in different cities of his empire, and to these, as we have seen, he likewise dedicated temples.

When he died there died also the real power to live and grow in his empire. He left no son like himself, and the Chaldean people were unable to produce another man worthy to sit upon his throne and sway his scepter.

CHAPTER III.

THE LAST YEARS OF THE CHALDEAN EMPIRE.

THE throne of Babylon, which Nebuchadrezzar had made so potent a force in the world, was occupied at once upon his death by Amil-Marduk, the biblical Evil-merodach¹ (man or servant of Marduk), the son of Nebuchadrezzar (561–560 B. C.). So strong had been Nebuchadrezzar's hold upon the people that there was no attempt at disturbances in the transfer of power to his son.

Of his reign we know almost nothing, for no inscriptions of his own have been found. Two allusions from the outside give our only possible view of his brief reign. The first of these comes, as so much of our information of his father's reign, from the Hebrews. The writer of the Second Book of Kings² states that in the first year of his reign, and thirty-seven years after the captivity of Jehoiachin, he took the Hebrew exile out of prison. From that time Jehoiachin enjoyed the fare of a king and wore the garments of royalty in exchange for the prison garb which he had worn so long. Of this act of mercy, which is, however, not

¹ 2 Kings xxv, 27; Jer. lii, 31; LXX reads Εὐαλμαρωδέκ, and Berossos has the form Ἀμιλμαρούδοκος. See Haupt, "Ueber den Halbvocal u im Assyrischen," *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, ii, pp. 266, 284, ff.

² 2 Kings xxv, 27–30; comp. Jer. lii, 31–34.

inconsistent with the remaining facts concerning this king, there is no other record. To Berossos¹ we owe the remaining reference to this reign. He says that Evil-merodach ruled unlawfully and tyrannically. It may be that the release of Jehoiachin was one expression of unlawful rule, and that it was the priestly or the national party whose feeling toward the king Berossos expresses.² Such men would naturally hate a king who showed any feeling of sympathy or help for the accursed people who had cost Babylon so dear in lives and treasure for their subduing. For this or some other cause Evil-merodach lost the loyalty of enough of his subjects to make successful a plot against his life. In the second full year of his reign he was assassinated. His reign left no mark upon his country's history, but the violent end of his life was an ominous portent of the desperate days that were in the future. The assassination of a king makes the dark periods of Assyrian history cry out a warning to the Chaldeans.

The plan for the slaying of Amil-Marduk had been devised by Nergal-shar-usur (Neriglissor—that

¹ Berossos, Frag. 14, in Müller-Didot, *Frag. Hist. Græc.*, ii, p. 507 (comp. Eusebius, *Chron.*, 49, 22, ff.), says of Evil-merodach, $\tau\mu\sigma\tau\acute{a}\zeta\tau\acute{\omega}\nu\pi\rho\gamma\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu\acute{\alpha}\nu\mu\omega\zeta\kappa\acute{\alpha}\acute{\alpha}\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\gamma\omega\zeta$. This $\acute{\alpha}\nu\mu\omega\zeta$ is supported by the Stele of Nabonidus (see *Die Inschrift der Stele Nabuna'id's*, von L. Messerschmidt, pp. 18, 30), which represents this king and Labashi-Marduk as law-breakers (see col. v, lines 33, 34).

² Tiele (*Geschichte*, ii, pp. 457, 464) argues that the restoration of Jehoiachin does not fit the character of Evil-merodach nor the other chronological indications, and therefore proposes to ascribe it to Neriglissor. The point is, however, not well taken.

is, “Nergal, protect the king”), and had probably been executed by him or upon his order. He now became king of Babylon, and had likewise a brief reign (559–556 B.C.). He was an influential man long before the death of Nebuchadrezzar. He it was, probably, who appeared at Jerusalem during the war of Nebuchadrezzar,¹ holding the office of *rab-mag*, and engaging in important diplomatic duties. His family was influential in business affairs, as the numerous contract tablets² from that period abundantly testify. Whatever his origin may have been, he had at least the station, or the power, to gain the hand of Nebuchadrezzar’s daughter in marriage. In his most important inscription³ he calls his father Bel-shum-ishkun, of whom nothing is known. So far as his ability would permit he followed in all things the example of the great king who had made the empire; his inscriptions even being in a similar style. His pride, likewise, was in the adornment and the increase of Babylon, and his first concern was to beautify the temple E-sagila. Before its doors had stood great bronze dragons, to warn away the evil; these he covered with silver. The temple E-zida of Borsippa he also decorated and beautified. In these

¹ Jer. xxxix, 3.

² See, for example, Strassmaier, *Inscriften von Nabuchodonosor, König von Babylon*, No. 83, p. 53 (translated by Peiser, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, iv, p. 187, No. x); No. 266, pp. 159, 160 (translated by Peiser, *op. cit.*, p. 195, No. xxiv).

³ The Ripley Cylinder, published by Budge, *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, x, part 3 (translated by Bezold, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, ii, part 2, 77, ff.).

works he honored the gods who had brought him from the world of commerce even to the rule of an empire, and to them he pays the tribute of words of passionate devotion, heaping word upon word of prayer and of praise. It remained only now that he should accomplish some work for the canal system of Babylon. In this his first care was to regulate the course of the canal upon which the city was built, this being a channel of the Euphrates itself, which was now changed so that, as in former times, it should pass directly by the temple of E-sagila. The eastern arm of the canal was also walled up, that its current might flow with sweet water, unmixed with sand.

The residence of Nergal-shar-usur was in the same palace as that of Nebuchadrezzar, and in this he carried on extensive alterations and improvements. The first of them concerned its foundations, which the canal had made unsafe, and the last of them were put upon the lofty summit of the building. In these works the chief part was played by the ever-present brick, but mention is made also of the cedar beams, which came, as before, from the Lebanon.

There is no mention in the life of Nergal-shar-usur of any wars throughout his empire. It is, however, scarcely probable that he could have reigned without any disturbances requiring for their suppression the force of arms. It was the custom of the Babylonian kings to say nothing of war; in this he followed the former usage.

Whether a warrior himself or not, he kept his empire intact, and the Chaldean power suffered no loss from that which Nebuchadrezzar had won. Better even than was to be expected did the empire sustain itself.

The oft-repeated prayer¹ of Nergal-shar-usur for a long reign was not granted. In 556 his life ended, and his son succeeded him. Labashi-Marduk, whose name puzzled even Berossos and the Greeks in general, who represent it as Labassarachos, or Labarosoarchodos, was but a youth² when he became king. At once he became the subject of a conspiracy, directed against him, says tradition, because he displayed evil traits of character. That this reason was a mere excuse for a deep plot of the priesthood to wrest the throne from his hands there can be little doubt. Labashi-Marduk reigned but nine months (556), and was then killed. His successor was not a Chaldean at all, but a native Babylonian not related to the reigning house, and this increases the probability that beneath these events lay schemes which were slowly working out toward ruin. Plot and counterplot would not add strength to the empire, and assassination boded ill to a stable government.

¹ So, for example, “O Marduk, great lord, lord of the gods, glorious, light of the gods, I pray thee; may I, according to thy exalted unchangeable command, enjoy the glory of the house which I have built, may I attain unto old age in it” (Cambridge Cylinder, col. ii, lines 31-34).

² Berossos calls him *παῖς* (Frag. 14, Müller-Didot, *op. cit.*, ii, p. 507), and this is confirmed by the Nabonidus Stele, cols. iv and v. See Messerschmidt, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

As soon as Labashi-Marduk was dead the conspirators chose as king a man who had participated in the revolution, for such it undoubtedly was. The man chosen to ascend the throne was Nabonidus (Nabu-naidu, the god "Nabu is glorious"), a man of distinguished position. His father was Nabu-balatsu-iqbi,¹ to whom is given the same title as Nergal-shar-usur had added to his father's name. Nabonidus was a man of piety, beyond even the example of the Chaldeans who had preceded him. He was a builder of temples and a restorer of them, and this appears to have absorbed his chief energies. This work he carried on in a different and in a more thorough way than either Nebuchadrezzar or Nergal-shar-usur. These had been content to take down a ruined temple to its foundations upon the earth's surface, and then to rebuild it of a size and a magnificence surpassing that which it had been. Not so this new servant of the gods. He was not content to reach merely the earth's surface as he began the reconstruction of a temple. His workmen must burrow in the earth until the original foundation stones of the temple's first builder were found. This was often no easy task. As we have seen before, the temples of Babylonia were constantly in decay, and this led to repeated restorations. These restorations must often have left the work of previous builders covered with debris and difficult to find.

¹Abu Habba Cylinder, col. i, line 6, V R. 64, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, iii, part 2, p. 97.

In many rebuildings the site even of the temple was partly or wholly changed. Amid all these difficulties and discouragements his work went on. In almost every case the foundation stones were found at last, and the king's name who had caused the first stone to be laid was then read, and a careful record made of the fact. The finding of these names of ancient kings led to a study of the historical records of the past, which the royal libraries still preserved. Out of the study of these ancient inscriptions the historiographers of the court of Nabonidus gradually learned the dates of past events of importance and the order of the events themselves.

The next step in this interesting development was to state, in the inscriptions of Nabonidus, that such and such a king's name had been found, and that the king had reigned so many years before the king who was now renewing their fallen works. These notices in the inscriptions of Nabonidus make his inscriptions of surpassing value to the student of the past.¹ No longer are building inscriptions dreary wastes of boasting words; out of them come names buried otherwise in the mists of the past. These names also have their proper perspective, for the royal scribe has written with them the number of years before Nabonidus they had lived. But for these notices many a definitely known king whose own inscriptions have later greeted the explorer's spade could not

¹ See above, book i, chap. xii, vol. i, pp. 312, ff.

be assigned his proper place in the development of his country's political history. His own texts bear no allusion, at times, to his ancestors, and no hint as to his chronological position. But the scribes of Nabonidus had lists of kings, now lost, and were able at once to locate these monarchs in their proper place. Whether consciously or not, Nabonidus thus became a patron of letters and history, and made all his race debtor to him for his archaeological researches among ruined palaces and temples. Former monarchs who held possession of Babylon had been eager to have researches pursued into the history of the past, but only that their own names might be connected with real or supposed ancestors of renown.¹ To this weakness there is no analogy in Nabonidus. His inscriptions are burdened more with the names of gods than of men, and with no hero of the past does he attempt to connect his own lineage.

These archaeological researches were interesting to Nabonidus and the scholars of his court, but they appear to have worked ill for the state. The king must have given himself to them to the loss of time, energy, and enthusiasm for the duties of kingcraft, to which he appears to have given little heed. He did not reside in Babylon at all, but at Tema,² probably an insignificant place, with no

¹ So, for example, Esarhaddon. See above, pp. 3, 4.

² Pinches (*Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, vii, 171) has most improbably sought to connect the place with a certain *Tu-ma*. See further Hagen, *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, ii, p. 236, footnote.

other influence in history. There he spent his time absorbed in great plans of building and of restoration, enrapt in the work of his scholars, who were disentangling the threads that led away into the dawn of human history, and devoted to prayers and good works before the gods. Imagination conceives him not as busied with concerns of state in the capital or at the head of an army seeking new territory or defending old, but rather as going about his lands watching the progress of work upon a temple, or stepping down into excavations to look upon the inscribed name of some old king which no eye had seen for thousands of years. Though there is no clear statement in his records to this effect, it seems almost certain that the great concerns of state were left to his son, Bel-shar-usur ("Bel protect the king," the biblical Belshazzar), who was a sort of regent during probably a large part of the reign. That the position of Bel-shar-usur was unusual appears quite clearly from the manner of the allusions to him in Nabonidus's inscriptions. At the end of some of them his name is coupled in the prayers with that of Nabonidus, and blessings are especially invoked upon him.¹ No such usage as this appears in any other text, and there must be a specific reason for it, which it is simplest to find in his regency. This is sup-

¹ So, for example: "From sin against thy exalted godhead guard me, and grant me, as a gift, life for many days, and in the heart of Belshazzar, my firstborn son, the offspring of my body, establish reverence for thy great godhead. May he not incline to sin, but enjoy the fullness of life" (small inscription of Ur, col. ii, lines 20-31).

ported, likewise, by the otherwise inexplicable conduct of Nabonidus during the most threatening situation in all the history of Babylon. When the army of Cyrus, as will be shown later, was approaching the city he remained in retirement at Tema, and gave over the control and leadership completely to Bel-shar-usur. By this regency of Belshazzar is also explained the origin of the Jewish tradition preserved in the book of Daniel, which makes Belshazzar,¹ and not Nabonidus, the last king of Babylon. That it had a historic basis there is reason to believe.

As we have no historic accounts of events in the earlier part of the reign of Nabonidus, it will be necessary to reconstruct those years from the slight notices which are given them in his own inscriptions—and these notices are naturally concerned primarily with building. At the beginning of every inscription after his title of king of Babylon Nabonidus is careful always to add the words, "Preserver of E-sagila and E-zida," thus connecting his name continually with the greatest shrines of his race. It was not, however, in these two temples that his chiefest interest centered. It was perhaps useful for reasons of state that he should thus appear as their patron, but he did not show to either a reverence more real than words. He did not even pay to E-sagila the annual New Year's visit, which was an act sacredly followed by the kings who had ruled before him. His de-

¹ Dan. v, 1, 30, 31.

votion was paid the more to other shrines, in other cities. For this there was some justification to be found in their almost complete neglect by recent generations. None the less is this custom of Nabonidus surprising in a Babylonian king.

Perhaps the chief work of Nabonidus was the restoration, the rebuilding, indeed, of the temple of the sun, E-babbara, in the ancient city of Sippar. Forty-five years before, Nebuchadrezzar had restored this temple, probably to honor the people of Sippar and attach them loyally to his person. Its walls were now fallen, and in this we see a curious comment either upon the carelessness of Nebuchadrezzar's workmen or the partial character of his restoration. No such work as that would satisfy the careful Nabonidus. The sun god Shamash was first supplied with temporary quarters for his occupancy. Then the temple was razed to the ground, and the foundations examined for the name of the first builder. Nebuchadrezzar had not found it when his restorations were made, and it was not found now until the excavations had been carried far beneath the surface. Then at last appeared the old corner stone, and upon it the name of Naram-Sin, who had caused it to be laid three thousand two hundred years before.¹ The finding of this stone so filled Nabonidus with delight that he is moved to say that Shamash himself had shown it to him. In such words would an Assyrian king have celebrated a bloody victory over

¹ See above, vol. i, p. 318.

men who died to save their own firesides! Then exactly upon that same site, moving an inch neither this way nor that, the stone was laid again, with all splendor of ceremony and of honor. Above it rose the new temple more splendid than the old. For its roof no less than five thousand cedar beams were required, while still more of the precious wood had to be used for its great doors. So the new temple was finished, and into it was the god Shamash led by the hand of Nabonidus, with rejoicing, with display of all devotion, and with prayers to Shamash that his care might be about the king who had thus honored him.

At about the same time, and perhaps immediately afterward, Nabonidus began the restoration of the temple E-ulbar, the shrine of the goddess Anunit, in the city of Sippar-Anunit. In the same manner as before he sought the foundation stone, but this time without such intense earnestness, and also without success. He was satisfied with the discovery of the foundation stone of Shagarakti-Buriash,¹ upon which he laid anew the foundations, and then reerected the temple. To this new home the goddess was introduced with gifts and with prayers. Not for himself only were these prayers offered, but also for the future. It was the desire of Nabonidus that in the days to come other kings might be raised up to rebuild the temple when his work should have outlived its days and the temple again be in decay.

¹ See above, vol. i, p. 318.

But there were other great works yet to be done, and the plans of the king for building not empires, but temples, had full sway in his active mind. His thoughts were continually turning far away from Babylon and its neighboring cities to a great city in the far north. Harran, a name once great in the history of the peoples of the Euphrates and the Tigris, had for centuries been of little moment. The Manda had ruined its streets and buildings, and destroyed its commercial importance. The great temple of Sin, the holiest shrine in all the north country, a temple bound by ancient ties to the great temple of Sin in Ur of the south land, was in ruins. The Manda had passed by, and as in their hearts there was no reverence for Sin, his temple fell before their destructive wave, and lay a ghastly heap of ruins, its bricks melting away into mud. To the eye of reason it might seem as though the power of Sin were small that he could not even defend his own house from such despoilers. But not so to the faith of Nabonidus, for to his thought Sin had been angry and had suffered the Manda—nay, had caused them—to break down his house. How better could he punish his worshipers, if that were his will, than to take away from their hearts the solace of worship in his temple?

At the very beginning of the reign of Nabonidus he dreamed a dream. Before him, as in a vision, stood the great gods Marduk and Sin. Then spoke Marduk and said, “Nabonidus, king

of Babylon, with the horses of thy wagons, bring bricks, build E-Khulkhlul, and let Sin, the great lord, have his dwelling therein." In fear answered Nabonidus, "The temple, which thou hast commanded me to build, the Manda surround it, and widespread are his forces." But answered Marduk, "The Manda, of whom thou speakest, they, their country, and the kings their allies are no more." Before the great god had commanded the rebuilding of this temple he had arranged to remove the obstacle of a warlike force. It was well that he had. An Assyrian king would have attacked any force about an honored god's temple, driven it away, and then rebuilt; so would the old Babylonians, but this new apostle of building would have none of war. Even upon the god's assurance that the Manda were no more about Harran, Nabonidus shrank in fear from the task. At last duty drove him on, and he essayed the great work. Upon all his vast empire he laid a levy for men for the work. From Gaza, on the borders of Egypt, from far beyond the Euphrates, from the eastern limits of his empire they came—governors, princes, kings—to help with the work. It was not long since the temple had last been rebuilt, for Asshurbanapal (668–625 B. C.) had rebuilt it upon the foundations which Shalmaneser II (859–825 B. C.) had laid. Stronger than before arose the great new walls. Upon them, for the roof, were placed great cedar beams from the Amanus, while doors of sweet-smelling cedar swung to and fro upon their fastenings. So great

was the glory of the new temple that the whole city of Harran shone "like the new moon."¹ In this new home, with prayer and joyful ceremony, was Sin, with his companions, brought, and another work of duty and honor had been added to the glories of the reign of Nabonidus. But in all this there is no word of the affairs of state. The gods were honored, but what of men? The day of judgment was slowly moving on. While Nabonidus built temples, remained away from Babylon, and looked not upon his army, another people of a fresh and almost untried race were husbanding old and seeking new strength for the undoing of all this splendor. The hour of their triumph had almost come.

The beginnings of new powers in the world's history are usually obscure, and for later ages difficult to trace out. So is it with the beginnings of that power which had slowly been preparing to engulf Babylonia. Some steps in its progress may now be regarded as reasonably clear, and these must now be followed. When Nineveh fell it was not at the behest of Babylonia only. A new power, fresh from a long rest and not wasted by civilization's insidious pressure, had contributed to that overthrow. This new people was the Manda, and in the years that followed the Manda had not been idle. To them had fallen in the partition of the Assyrian empire the whole of the old land of

¹ Nabonidus, the Great Cylinder of Abu-Habba, col. ii, line 25. Comp. *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, iii, part 2, p. 103.

Assyria, with northern Babylonia. The very ownership of such territory as this was itself a call to the making of an empire. To this the Manda had set themselves, and with extraordinary and rapid success. While Nebuchadrezzar lived they maintained peace with him and offered no threats against Babylonia. To the north and west their forces spread. These movements we cannot trace in detail. From the Manda, who were men of action, and not writers of books, there have come to us no stories of conquest. From the events which follow, of which we have Babylonian accounts, we can trace with reasonable certainty, even though broadly, their progress. As early as 560 B. C. their border had been extended as far west as the river Halys, which served as the boundary between them and the kingdom of Lydia, over which Croesus, of proverbial memory, was now king (560–546 B. C.). If no violent end came to a victorious people such as the Manda now were, it could not be long before the rich plains, the wealthy cities, and the great waterways of Babylonia would tempt them southward and the great clash would come. If to such brute force of conquest as they had already abundantly shown they should add gifts for organization and administration, there was no reason why all their possessions should not be welded again into a great empire, as the Assyrians had done before with a large part of them. Their king was now Astyages,¹ or, as

¹ See Frag. 29, Müller-Didot, *Ctesiae Cnidii Fragmenta*, p. 45.

the Babylonian inscriptions name him, Ishtuvegu.¹ Our knowledge of him is too scant to admit of a judgment as to his character. A man of war of extraordinary capacity he certainly was, but perhaps little else. However that may be, he was not to accomplish the ruin of Nabonidus. What he had gained was to be used to that end by another, and he was now preparing.

In Anshan, a province in the land of Elam, a great man had arisen. From Elam for centuries no impulse had been given in the world's history. The people had rested. Kings had ruled over them, indeed, but their influence had been little beyond their own borders. When Cyrus was born, son of Kambyses, a place was ready for him, and greatness soon found it. Cyrus, king of Anshan—the title had no high sound, and to it were added no other titles of rule in other lands. But in Cyrus the primary power of conquest was strong. He began at once a career of almost unparalleled conquest, and later displayed in extraordinary degree the power so to organize the result of one victory as to make it contributory to the next. His first foe was naturally Astyages, king of the Manda, whose attention he had attracted. We do not know what deeds of Cyrus led Astyages to determine upon attacking him, whether he had made reprisals upon the borders of the empire of the Manda, or had shown else-

¹ Nabonidus, the Great Cylinder of Abu-Habba, col. i, line 32, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, iii, part 2, pp. 98, 99.

where ability which might later prove dangerous to the aspirations of the Manda. In 553 B. C. Astyages led an army against this new Asiatic conqueror. All the advantages seemed to lie upon the side of Astyages. He had victories behind him, he had the levies of an empire already vast on which to draw. But these and all other advantages were overturned by treachery. His own troops rebelled against him and delivered him into the hands of Cyrus,¹ and that bound as a prisoner. Cyrus then took Ecbatana, sacked it,² and overwhelmed the state. In an hour he had leaped from the position of king of Anshan, a rank hardly greater than petty prince, to the proud position of king of the Manda. A whole empire already made was his. Well might he assume a new title and call himself king of the Parsu—out of which has come to us the word “Persians.” King of the Persians—in that new title of Cyrus was gathered all the impetus of a new and terrible force in the world. For his coming the day of judgment had waited. The day of great Semitic conquerors was waning, a new conqueror of the great unknown Indo-European races had arisen, and a new day had thus dawned. What did it mean for humanity—for civilization?

The sudden victory of Cyrus over the empire of

¹ Annals of Nabonidus, col. ii, lines 1, 2. See Hagen, “Keilschrifturkunden zur Geschichte des Königs Cyrus,” *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, ii, pp. 218, 219.

² *Ibid.*, col. ii, lines 3, 4.

the Manda filled the whole western world with alarm. The empire of Cyrus now extended to the Halys, and beyond that river was Lydia. How soon Cyrus would cross it none knew. He was probably only waiting until he could assimilate the forces of the Manda with his own; for such a man could be content with no dominion that was less than world-wide. Croesus determined to strike the first blow himself, but not single-handed. He formed a confederation in the spring of 546, and almost every power of significance in the whole west joined it. Amasis, king of Egypt; Nabonidus, king of Babylon;¹ Croesus, king of Lydia, and even his friendly allies, the Spartans²—these formed an array that must be invincible. The leader was Croesus, and that he should fail seemed impossible. Behind him was an army that had never known defeat, beneath him were the sure oracles of Delphi. But the confidence of Croesus was too great; he would not even wait for the expected contributions of men from his allies; with trust in his gods and in his own army he started out to meet Cyrus, and entered Kappadokia. Cyrus met him with all his forces. The unexpected, the impossible, happened, and Croesus was defeated. Cyrus pursued, and again Croesus gave battle, in the valley of Hermos. In the army of Cyrus were bodies of men mounted on camels;³ before them stood the

¹ Herodotus, i, lxxvii.

² *Ibid.*, i, lxxix.

³ *Ibid.*, i, lxxx; Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*, vii. i, § 48; Ælian, *Hist. Animal*, iii, 7.

Lydian cavalry. It was the barbarous east mounted upon its uncanny and clumsy animal of the desert opposed to the civilization of the west with its clean-limbed horses. But the barbarians on camels threw the cavalry into confusion, and again was Crœsus beaten, and this time overwhelmed. He retreated to the citadel of Sardes, and sent messengers to his allies begging for assistance, which, naturally enough, never came. In fourteen days Sardes fell, and Crœsus was in the hands of Cyrus.¹ The Lydian empire was also swallowed up in Persia. Crœsus was taken in the autumn of 546, and before the end of 545 the entire peninsula of Asia Minor was a part of the Persian empire, divided into satrapies and administered with a strong hand. Even the isles of the sea were giving submission to the power that had arisen out of the wilds of Asia, ghostlike in a night, whose ruler was but a year before unknown in name even to the Greeks of the mainland, who had now become his subjects.

Cyrus had now fully prepared the way for the absorption of Babylonia, with its valuable Syro-phœnician states reaching even to the Mediterranean. During all these years Nabonidus had

¹ According to a story preserved by Herodotus (i, lxxxv–lxxxvii), Crœsus, seeing the end of his fortunes near, prepared a great funeral pyre and assembled upon it with himself, also his family, his nobles, and his choicest possessions; when the fire was started Zeus put out the fire and Apollo bore the aged king with his daughters away into the Hyperborean country. On the other hand, we are told that Crœsus lived on as the friend of Cyrus and accepted from him the fief of Barêné in Media (Ktesias, Frag. 29, § 4, in Müller-Didot, *Ctesiae Cnidii Fragmenta*, p. 46).

been building temples and searching out interesting bits of ancient history. If he had been consolidating his defenses and preparing to hold his empire against this wave of barbarians, the course of human history might have been widely different. Even Greece might have been spared the need of its heroic sacrifice in the defense of all the west had gained, from the hordes, full-blooded and strong, out of the mountains of Elam. But Nabonidus had not prepared for war or for defense, and it was now too late. In the year 549, when the Lydian king was making ready to fight to the bitter end, Nabonidus was in Tema, as the Chronicle¹ shows. Of 548 we know nothing,² but there is no risk in supposing that he was still absorbed in temples and their repairs. In 547, so hurried the years along, he was still in Tema, and did not even enter Babylon to pay reverence at the great shrine of the gods or to attend to the pressing business of state. On the fifth day of the month of Nisan the king's mother died at Dur-Karasu, on the Euphrates, above Sippar. For her great mourning was made, and still there is no word of setting Babylon or the land in preparation. Yet in this same year—and the Babylonian Chronicle is the witness for it—the threat of Cyrus against Babylon was made in no uncertain manner. On the

¹ Col. ii, line 5 (Hagen, *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, ii, p. 219; Schrader, *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, part 2, p. 131).

² This was the eighth year of Nabonidus, and on his Chronicle tablet nothing is said at all of this year, but a blank space of about two lines is left. See Hagen, *op. cit.*, p. 218.

fifteenth day of the same month of Nisan he crossed the Tigris below Arbela and entered Assyria. Here he took possession of part of the land which appears to have been partly or wholly independent of Nabonidus. The name which Cyrus gave to the land is broken off in the Chronicle,¹ but we shall probably not go far astray if we conjecture that some petty prince² had here set up a little kingdom.

Babylonian soil was now possessed by Cyrus. It was the beginning of the end. The next year opens with the same melancholy record that the king was in Tema.³ His son, Bel-shar-usur, was with the army in Accad.⁴ From this time on it is proper to say that he was easily the chief actor, on the Babylonian side, in the tragedy. Of him we know little indeed. To the Jews his name was an object of hatred, for he had shown contempt for them and the God of whom they would teach the world. But from the Babylonian point of view he shines forth in all that we know of him as a man intensely national, able, earnest in defense of his native land. That he helped greatly to postpone the now impending ruin is highly probable. But he had no support from his father

¹ Col. ii, line 16. Hagen says that there were remains of *two* signs, and the first seemed to be *su*. Was not the second probably *ri*?—the name Assyria. An allusion to this movement is preserved in Xenophon, *Anabasis*, iii, 4, 7–12.

² The “king” of the country was killed, but his name is not given. See the text of Hagen, col. ii, line 17.

³ *Ibid.*, col. ii, line 19.

⁴ *Ibid.*

—the man of books. In this year (546), on the twenty-first day of Sivan, there was some difficulty with Elamites in Babylonia.¹ We do not know its meaning or its results; for the Chronicle is broken off and leaves us in tantalizing fashion. But that this was only another move in the same general plan is at least probable. After this year the Babylonian Chronicle again breaks off abruptly, and for six years we know nothing of the progress of events. Into these years probably went some of the building operations which have already been described. Nabonidus cared, or seemed to care, little for his country. It was his gods only that filled the horizon for him.²

When next the chronicler resumes his story the seventeenth year of the king's reign has come. It is the year 539. The army of Cyrus is somewhere in northern Babylonia. The great Persian empire is now ready to complete and round out its borders by the addition of Babylonia, with even its imperial capital. The opening lines of the year's annals are broken off, but if they were still preserved, we should probably not find in them the fateful words, "The king was in Tema." He was now fully aroused to the gravity of the situation, and was active in measures of preparation. It seems almost irony to say that these measures were

¹ *Ibid.*, col. ii, line 22.

² That so little military preparation was made by Belshazzar or others in authority is partially to be explained by the fact that Cyrus was long regarded as an ally of Nabonidus (see the Nabonidus Chronicle, i, 28–33). It was the Lydian victory that opened Chaldean eyes to the true situation.

not for practical defense against a terrible foe; they were not for a prolonged siege. Such preparations would have been both natural and in a sense easy of accomplishment. Nebuchadrezzar had made Babylon the strongest fortress in all the world. Even a small force of brave men could have held it for years against any force which Cyrus could muster; and that there were brave men still in Babylon's army there is every reason to believe. But the preparations of Nabonidus were not for national safety and independence, they were not for the safety of men at all. In the crucial hour of his country's history his whole thought was of gods, and not of men. He would save gods, men might save themselves as best they might. From every part of the land of Babylonia the statues of the gods were hastily removed from the temples which Nabonidus had built with such exaggeration of painstaking care, as well as from other temples upon which he had laid no hand of restoration—if, indeed, there were any such. From Marad and from Kish came gods of whose worth or power the history of Babylonia has heard little; from Kharsag-kalama came Belit and her goddesses. By the end of the month Elul all the gods and goddesses had been brought to Babylon. Nabonidus appears to have himself remained in Sippar, perhaps to avoid the danger of capture and death in the capital, whose ultimate fall into the hands of Cyrus he must have foreseen, or rather, perhaps, that he might in the hour of his

distress lean heavily on the arm of Shamash, whom he had so signally honored in the magnificent temple of E-babbara.

While gods were hastening thus to be crowded into the spaces of Babylon's temples the army of Cyrus was slowly marching on, and apparently without resistance. Would all Babylonia be his without one single blow? It were a disgrace indeed, and the land was spared that final ignominy. When Cyrus reached the city of Upi the army of Accad opposed his advance,¹ but whether Bel-shar-usur, who had commanded it, was now in the van does not appear. The opposition was in vain, and Cyrus drove it before him and moved southward resistlessly. Sippar was taken, without a blow, on the fourteenth day of Tammuz, and Nabonidus fled. Two days later the van of the army of Cyrus entered Babylon, as the gates swung open without resistance² to admit it. Cyrus himself was not in command, but had remained in the background while Ugbaru (Gobryas), governor of Gutium, led the advance. Nabonidus was taken in the city, whither he had fled from Sippar.

The fall of Babylon in this fashion is one of the surprises of history. That a city which had bred warriors enough to rule the whole civilized world should at last lay down its arms and tamely sub-

¹ Nabonidus Chronicle, iii, lines 12, 13; Hagen, *op. cit.*, p. 223; *Keilinschrift. Bibl.*, iii, part 2, pp. 133-135.

² The phrase (Nabonidus Chronicle, iii, line 15) is *bala saltum*, "without battle." It is a sorry end after all Nebuchadrezzar's efforts to make Babylon impregnable.

mit—it is impossible, and yet it is true. Nay, more is true: Ugbaru had indeed entered the city without the use of force, but there is no word that his presence was welcome. He must surely have been received with many a surly look, with mutterings of hate, with ill-concealed disgust. But on the third day of Marcheshwan Cyrus held entry into the city. It was a triumphal entrance, and all Babylon greeted him with plaudits and hailed him as a deliverer. So fickle was the populace, so ready to say, "The king is dead; long live the king."

Babylon was now in the possession of an entirely new race of men. The Indo-Europeans, silent for centuries, had come at last to dominion. Nineveh, the greatest center for the pure Semitic stock, had fallen first; it was now Babylon's hour, and Babylon likewise was fallen. The fall of a city which had long wielded a power almost world-wide would at any period be a matter of great moment. But this fall of Babylon was even more than this. Babylon was now the representative city not merely of a world-wide power, it was the representative of Semitic power. The Semites had built the first empire of commanding rank in the world when Hammurabi conquered Sumer and Accad and made Babylon capital of several kingdoms at once. Out of this center had gone the colonists who had built another and, after a time, a great empire at Nineveh. For centuries two Semitic centers of power had vied with each other

for the dominion of the world. Both had held it, each in his turn. For nearly a century Nineveh had been in the hands of another race, and the Semitic civilization had been supplanted there. Babylon had been made the center of a new world power by the Chaldean people, but they also were Semites. This branch of the Semitic people had had a short lease of power indeed. The power was now taken from them as the representatives of the Semitic race. Never from that hour until the age of Islam was a Semitic power to command a world-wide empire. The power of the Semite seemed hopelessly broken in that day, and that alone makes the peaceful fall of Babylon a momentous event.

But Babylon stood for more than mere Semitic power. It stood in a large sense for Semitic civilization. As has been so often pointed out before in these pages, Assyria represented far more than Babylonia the prowess of the Semite upon fields of battle. Babylon had stood for Semitic civilization, largely intermixed with many elements, yet Semitic after all. Here were the great libraries of the Semitic race. Here were the scholars who copied so painstakingly every little omen or legend that had come down to them out of the hoary past. Here were the men who calculated eclipses, watched the moon's changes, and looked nightly from observatories upon the stately march of constellations over the sky. Here were the priests who preserved knowledge of the ancient

Sumerian language, that its sad plaints and solemn prayers might be kept for use in temple worship. Much of all this was worthy of preservation—if not for any large usefulness, certainly for its record of human progress upward. All this was now fallen into alien hands. Would it be preserved? Would it be ruthlessly or carelessly destroyed? The greatest thoughts of the Semitic mind and the greatest emotions of its heart were not, indeed, Babylonian, and even if they were, they could not die. Not for many centuries would the Semite be able to found another such center. It was indeed a solemn hour of human history.

The glory of Babylon is ended. The long procession of princes, priests, and kings has passed by. No city so vast had stood on the world before it. No city with a history so long has even yet appeared. From the beginnings of human history it had stood. It was in other hands now, and it would soon be a shapeless mass of ruins, standing alone in a sad, untilled desert.

APPENDIX.

A.

LITERATURE.

THE references given in footnotes indicate with sufficient clearness the bibliography of the subject, but for convenience of reference the titles of books dealing directly with the history are here assembled, accompanied by brief comments to facilitate their use.

1. EXCAVATIONS AND DECIPHERMENT.

KAULEN, FR. *Assyrien und Babylonien nach den neuesten Entdeckungen*, 5th ed. Freiburg im Breisgau, 1899.

[The account of excavations and discoveries is on pp. 18-41 and 74-150. It is well presented, but pays little attention to the work of early travelers, and takes but slight notice of the most recent work, except that of the University of Pennsylvania, which is well handled.]

HOMMEL, FR. *Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens*. Berlin, 1885.

[The sections relating to discovery and decipherment are on pp. 58-134, and are more detailed than those of Kaulen.]

EVETTS, B. T. A. *New Light on the Holy Land*. London, 1891.

[Contains on pp. 79-129 a very useful narrative of discoveries and decipherment, with much attention to early travelers.]

MENANT, JOACHIM. *Les Langues perdues de la Perse et de l'Assyrie*. Paris, 1885.

2. HISTORY.

(a) *Babylonia and Assyria.*

HOMMEL, FR. Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens. Berlin, 1885.

——— Articles on “Babylonia” and “Assyria,” Dictionary of the Bible, ed. Hastings, vol. i. New York, 1898.

KING, LEONARD WILLIAM. Articles “Babylonia” and “Assyria” in Eucyclopædia Biblica, edited by the Rev. T. K. Cheyne and J. Sutherland Black, vol. i. New York, 1899.

[Very valuable outlines of the history, supplemented also by separate articles on important reigns, such as that of Assurbanapal.]

MUERDTER UND DELITZSCH. Geschichte von Babylonien und Assyrien, 2. Aufl. Calw und Stuttgart, 1891.

ROGERS, ROBERT W. Outlines of the History of Early Babylonia. Leipzig, 1895.

[Now largely replaced by the present work.]

SAYCE, A. H. A Primer of Assyriology. New York, 1895.

[Useful introductory outline.]

SMITH, GEORGE. The History of Babylonia, edited and brought up to date by the Rev. A. H. Sayce. London and New York, 1895.

[A brief and useful little book, but already needing revision. A similar volume by George Smith on Assyria, from the Earliest Times to the Fall of Nineveh, has not been revised.]

TIELE, C. P. Babylonisch-Assyrische Geschichte. Gotha, 1886.

[A work of great ability and distinction, and, though superseded in parts by more recent work, still indispensable for the advanced student.]

WINCKLER, HUGO. Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens. Leipzig, 1892.

[An important book to be used in supplement of Tiele. Very suggestive.]

——— Die Völker Vorderasiens (Der Alte Orient, 1. Jahrgang, Heft 1). Leipzig, 1899.

——— Die Politische Entwicklung Babyloniens und Assyriens (Der Alte Orient, 2. Jahrgang, Heft 1). Leipzig, 1900.

[Contains in but thirty-one pages an illuminating sketch of the development of Babylonian and Assyrian history.]

(b) *General Histories.*

The following books, while treating the history of Babylonia and Assyria only as part of the general history of the Orient, are, nevertheless, important as discussing phases of the history supplementary to the special histories, or as being written by Assyriologists who have given special emphasis to Assyria and Babylonia:

HELMOLT, HANS F. *Weltgeschichte.* Leipzig, 1899.

[Vol. iii, part 1, contains *Das Alte West Asien*, pp. 1-248, by Dr. Hugo Winckler, and is important not only because it is attractively written, but also because it sometimes gives a newer view of events than is given in the author's more detailed history mentioned above.]

HOMMEL, FR. *Abriss der Geschichte des alten Orients bis auf die Zeit der Perserkriege* (in Iwan v. Müller, *Handbuch der klassischen Alterthumswissenschaft*, Bd. iii), 2. Aufl. 1895.

— *Geschichte des alten Morgenlandes* (Sammlung Göschen, No. 43). Stuttgart, 1895. Translated into English as: *The Civilization of the East* [Temple Primers]. London, 1900.

KRALL, JAKOB. *Grundriss der Altorientalischen Geschichte.* Erster Theil: *Bis auf Kyros.* Wien, 1899.

[A valuable reference book, not so written as to be easily read.]

MASPERO, G. *The Dawn of Civilization, Egypt and Chaldea.* Edited by A. H. Sayce, translated by M. L. McClure. New York, 1894.

— *The Struggle of the Nations, Egypt, Syria, and Assyria.* Edited by A. H. Sayce, translated by M. L. McClure. New York, 1897.

— *The Passing of the Empires, 850 to 330 B. C.* Edited by A. H. Sayce, translated by M. L. McClure. New York, 1900.

[These three volumes supersede Professor Maspero's former treatises. They are magnificently illustrated, well translated, and are admirably supplied with references to the literature of every question relating to the history.]

McCURDY, JAMES FREDERICK. History, Prophecy, and the Monuments, or Israel and the Nations. Vol. i. To the Downfall of Samaria. New York, 1894. Vol. ii. To the Fall of Nineveh. New York, 1896. Vol. iii, completing the work, promised soon.

MEYER, EDUARD. Geschichte des Alterthums. I Band: Geschichte des Orients bis zur Begründung des Perserreiches. Stuttgart, 1884. II Band: Geschichte des Abendlandes bis auf die Perserkriege. Stuttgart, 1893.

SAYCE, A. H. Early Israel and the Surrounding Nations. New York, 1899.

[Babylonia and Assyria, pp. 199-264. This interesting sketch supplements Smith's History of Babylonia and Sayee's Primer of Assyriology.]

This list might be much extended if works of popular character were added to it. It is, however, intentionally restricted to works of scientific importance, based upon original sources.

For more extended bibliography of Babylonia and Assyria, comprising not merely the political history, but also religion, literature, and social life, the following books may be consulted:

BEZOLD, CARL. Kurzgefasster Ueberblick über die Babylonisch-Assyrische Literatur. Leipzig, 1886.

DELITZSCH, FRIEDRICH. Assyrian Grammar. London, 1889. (Literatura, pp. 55*-78.*)

JASTROW, MORRIS, JR. The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria. Boston, 1898. (Bibliography, pp. 705-738.)

[An exhaustive and accurate conspectus of the literature up to 1898.]

KAULEN, FR. Assyrien und Babylonien nach den neuesten Entdeckungen, 5th ed. Freiburg im Breisgau, 1899. (Litteratur, pp. 284-304).

[This bibliography is arranged chronologically, and is exceedingly valuable from 1620 to 1880, though many additions

ought even in those years to be made. After 1880 it falls off very much in completeness, and extends only to 1889. It is a pity that recent editions should not have extended it.]

LINCKE, A. Bericht über die Fortschritte der Assyriologie in den Jahren 1886–1893. Leipzig, 1894.

The current bibliography is to be sought in the following:

American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures (Continuing *Hebraica*). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

[This journal is published quarterly and contains an accurate and exhaustive bibliography by W. Muss-Arnolt.]

Orientalische Bibliographie, bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Dr. Lucian Scherman. Berlin.

[Semiannual.]

Orientalische Literatur-Zeitung, herausgegeben von F. E. Peiser. Berlin.

[Monthly. Contains a very valuable review of the journals and proceedings of learned societies. (*Aus gelehrten Gesellschaften und Zeitschriftenschau*.)]

Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie Orientale. Publ. sous la dir. de J. Oppert, E. Ledrain et Léon Heuzey. Paris.

[Appears at irregular intervals.]

Zeitschrift für Assyriologie, und verwandte Gebrete, in verbindung mit J. Oppert in Paris, Eb. Schrader in Berlin, und anderen herausgegeben von Carl Bezold in Heidelberg. Berlin.

[Quarterly.]

B.

THE DESTRUCTION OF SENNACHERIB'S ARMY.

THE following is the Egyptian tradition of the great pestilence as Herodotus has reproduced it:

"The next king, I was told, was a priest of Vulcan, called Sethôs. This monarch despised and neglected the warrior class of the Egyptians, as though he did not need their services. Among other indignities which he offered them he took from

them the lands which they had possessed under all the previous kings, consisting of twelve acres of choice land for each warrior. Afterward, therefore, when Sennacherib, king of the Arabians and Assyrians, marched his vast army into Egypt, the warriors one and all refused to come to his aid. On this the monarch, greatly distressed, entered into the inner sanctuary, and before the image of the god bewailed the fate which impended over him. As he wept he fell asleep, and dreamed that the god came and stood at his side, bidding him be of good cheer, and go boldly forth to meet the Arabian host, which would do him no hurt, as he himself would send those who should help him. Sethôs, then, relying on the dream, collected such of the Egyptians as were willing to follow him, who were none of them warriors, but traders, artisans, and market people; and with these marched to Pelusium, which commands the entrance into Egypt, and there pitched his camp. As the two armies lay here opposite one another there came in the night a multitude of field mice, which devoured all the quivers and bowstrings of the enemy and ate the thongs by which they managed their shields. Next morning they commenced their flight, and great multitudes fell, as they had no arms with which to defend themselves. There stands to this day in the temple of Vulcan a stone statue of Sethôs, with a mouse in his hand, and an inscription to this effect: ‘Look on me and learn to reverence the gods.’”¹

In explanation of this narrative it must be remembered that the mouse was a symbol of pestilence (1 Sam. vi, 5), and that Apollo, as the plague-dealer, is called Smintheus, mouse-god.

C.

THE DEFENSES OF BABYLON.

THE investigations of the last few years have thrown considerable light upon the walls of the city of Babylon, and the excavations already be-

¹ Herodotus, ii, chap. 141 (*History of Herodotus*, by George Rawlinson, London, 1880, vol. ii, pp. 219, 220).

gun by the German expedition on the site¹ are likely to set at rest some long-standing subjects of controversy. It is not the province of this book to discuss questions of topography, but the narrative of Nebuchadrezzar's elaborate reconstruction of the defenses of Babylon may perhaps be made more clear by a comparison with the two chief sources of our knowledge which are here given in translation.

The following is the description given by Herodotus:

"Assyria² possesses a vast number of great cities, whereof the most renowned and strongest at this time was Babylon, whither, after the fall of Nineveh, the seat of government had been removed. The following is a description of the place: The city stands on a broad plain, and is an exact square, a hundred and twenty furlongs in length each way,³ so that the entire circuit is four hundred and eighty furlongs.⁴ While such is its size, in magnificence there is no other city that approaches it. It is surrounded, in the first place, by a broad and deep moat, full of water, behind which rises a wall fifty royal cubits in width and two hundred in height.⁵ (The

¹ See above, vol. i, pp. 247, 248.

² Assyria as used in this passage manifestly is extended so as to include all Babylonia. See above, vol. i, p. 269.

³ This outer wall corresponds to Ninnitti-Bel in the descriptions of Nebuchadrezzar, and Herodotus could not have seen it, for it had been destroyed by Darius.

⁴ Four hundred and eighty stadia would be fifty-five and one quarter miles, which is impossible. The modern ruins, so far as can be ascertained, extend from north to south a distance of about five miles only.

⁵ The proportion of width to height is impossible. The interior of these walls was composed of sun-dried bricks, the outside was made of burnt bricks. Such a wall could not be raised to so great a height (about one hundred and five meters) on a base so narrow (about twenty-six meters); long before it could be reached the whole mass would collapse. The necessary proportions would be about a width of one third to two thirds of the height. See A. Billerbeck, *Der Festungsbau im Alten Orient*, Leipzig, 1900, p. 6.

royal cubit is longer by three fingers' breadth than the common cubit.)

"And here I may not omit to tell the use to which the mold dug out of the great moat was turned, nor the manner wherein the wall was wrought. As fast as they dug the moat the soil which they got from the cutting was made into bricks, and when a sufficient number were completed they baked the bricks in kilns. Then they set to building, and began with bricking the borders of the moat, after which they proceeded to construct the wall itself, using throughout for their cement hot bitumen, and interposing a layer of wattled reeds at every thirtieth course of the bricks. On the top, along the edges of the wall, they constructed buildings of a single chamber facing one another, leaving between them room for a four-horse chariot to turn. In the circuit of the wall are a hundred gates, all of brass, with brazen lintels and side posts. The bitumen used in the work was brought to Babylon from the Is, a small stream which flows into the Euphrates at the point where the city of the same name stands,¹ eight days' journey from Babylon. Lumps of bituman are found in great abundance in this river.

"The city is divided into two portions by the river which runs through the midst of it. This river is the Euphrates, a broad, deep, swift stream, which rises in Armenia and empties itself into the Erythraean Sea. The city wall is brought down on both sides to the edge of the stream; thence, from the corners of the wall, there is carried along each bank of the river a fence of burnt bricks. The houses are mostly three and four stories high; the streets all run in straight lines, not only those parallel to the river, but also the cross streets, which lead down to the water side. At the river end of these cross streets are low gates in the fence that skirts the stream, which are like the great gates in the outer wall, of brass, and open on the water.

"The outer wall is the main defense of the city. There is, however, a second inner² wall, of less thickness than the first, but very little inferior to it in strength. The center of each division of the town was occupied by a fortress. In the one stood the palace of the kings, surrounded by a wall of great strength and size; in the other was the sacred precinct of Jupiter Belus, a square in-

¹ The modern Hit. See above, vol. i, p. 287.

² This is the wall called Imgur-Bel by Nebuchadrezzar. See below and comp. above, p. 343.

closure two furlongs each way, with gates of solid brass; which was also remaining in my time. In the middle of the precinct there was a tower of solid masonry, a furlong in length and breadth, upon which was raised a second tower, and on that a third, and so on up to eight. The ascent to the top is on the outside, by a path which winds round all the towers. When one is about halfway up one finds a resting place and seats, where persons are wont to sit some time on their way to the summit. On the topmost tower there is a spacious temple, and inside the temple stands a couch of unusual size, richly adorned, with a golden table by its side. There is no statue of any kind set up in the place, nor is the chamber occupied of nights by anyone but a single native woman, who, as the Chaldeans, the priests of this god, affirm, is chosen for himself by the deity out of all the women of the land.”¹

In addition to this description of the city’s defenses Herodotus has also given an account of the supposed works of Semiramis and Nitocris,² but this is much less valuable than the passage quoted above.

It is evident that Herodotus knew only of two walls, one of which had already disappeared in his day, and that he had no knowledge of the outer defense wall beyond Nimitti-Bel, which was begun by Nabopolassar and finished by Nebuchadrezzar. We should therefore have a false impression of the outer defense of the city were we wholly dependent on his witness. He has indeed obviously mingled what he saw by his own eyes with what he was told by his cicerone, and it is no longer possible to differentiate them clearly.³

¹ I, 178–181 (*History of Herodotus*, by George Rawlinson, London, 1880, vol. i, pp. 297–302).

² I, 184–187.

³ Comp. Baumstark, sub voce Babylon in Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclopädie der classischen Wissenschaft*, ii.

The badly preserved fragments of Berossos¹ show that he had originally written of a threefold defense wall of the city, and this is confirmed fully by the passages from the text of Nebuchadrezzar which follows. This is translated with as close adhesion to the original as possible, in order to facilitate reference to the Babylonian text or to the transliterations of it, to which reference is given in the notes.

EAST INDIA HOUSE INSCRIPTION OF NEBUCHADREZZAR.²

Col. IV. 66 Imgur-Bel
 and Nimitti-Bel
 the great ramparts of Babylon
 which Nabopolassar,
 70 king of Babylon, the father who begot me,
 had made, but not finished
 their erection;

Col. V. 1 their moat had he dug, and
 two strong embankments
 with bitumen and burnt brick
 he constructed as its border;
 5 the embankments of the Arakhtu
 he had made, and
 walls of brick
 along the bank of the Euphrates
 had constructed, and
 10 had not finished
 the rest;
 from Du-azag,
 the place of those that decide destinies,
 the shrine of the Fates,

¹ See the assembled fragments in Müller, *Frag. Hist. Græc.*, ii, pp. 495, ff.

² For references to text and translations see above, p. 342, note 1. The translation here given owes much to Ball's excellent English version, but differs from it in adhering a little more closely to the original in some places, and in the total omission of a few phrases (indicated by dotted lines) the meaning of which is either unknown or extremely doubtful.

15 unto Ai-ibur-shabu,
 the street of Babylon,
 before the gate of Beltis,
 with . . . bricks,
 for the procession of the great lord Marduk
 20 he beautified the road.
 As for me, his firstborn son,
 the darling of his heart,
 Imgur-Bel
 and Nimitti-Bel,
 25 the great ramparts of Babylon,
 I finished;
 the sides of the embankment of its moat,
 the two strong embankments,
 with bitumen and burnt brick I built, and
 30 with the embankment, (which) my father had con-
 structed,
 I joined (them), and
 the city, for defense,
 I carried (them) round.
 A wall of brick,
 35 on the western side
 the fortress of Babylon
 I threw around.
 Ai-ibur-shabu
 the street of Babylon
 40 for the procession of the great lord Marduk
 with a high top-covering
 I filled, and
 with . . . bricks
 and stone from the mountains,
 45 Ai-ibur-shabu
 From . . . gate
 to

 for the procession of his godhead
 50 I made fair, and
 with what my father had built
 I joined (it), and
 I beautified
 the road

55

 Of Imgur-Bel
 and Nimitti-Bel
 the portals
 60 through the top-covering
 of the street of Babylou
 too low had become
 their entrances.
 These portals
 I tore down, and

Col. VI. 1 at water level their foundation
 with bitumen and brick
 I firmly laid, and
 with burnt brick and . . .
 5 of which bulls and huge serpents
 they make, the interior of them
 tastefully I constructed.
 Strong cedar beams
 for their roofing
 10 I laid over them.
 Doors of cedar
 (with) plating of copper ;
 lintels and hinges (?),
 of bronze, round its gates
 15 I set up.
 Strong bulls of bronze,
 and great serpents,
 by their thresholds I set up :
 those portals
 20 for the astonishment of multitudes of people
 with beauty I adorned.
 In order that the battle-storm to Imgur-Bel
 the wall of Babylon, might not reach ;
 what no king before me had done ;
 25 for four thousand cubits of ground
 on the sides of Babylon
 far away, so that they should not come near,
 a mighty rampart on the east,
 Babylon I threw around.
 30 Its moat I dug, and the bank of it

with bitumen and brick
I bound together, and
a mighty rampart on its bank
mountain high I built.

35 Its broad portals
I constructed, and
the doors of cedar, with plating of copper,
I set up.
That foes

40 the sides of Babylon might not approach;
great waters,
like the volume of seas,
I conducted round the land, and
the crossing of them

45 (was) like the crossing of the great sea,
of salt water.
A breaking forth of them
in order not to permit,
with a bank of earth

50 I embanked them, and
walls of burnt orick
I placeed around them.
The defenses skillfully
did I strengthen, and

55 the city of Babylon
I made fit for defense.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

A.

Abbas the Great receives ambassadors from Europe in Persia, i, 7.
Abbé Saint-Martin, i, 56, 66.
Abdi-Kheba of Jerusalem, letter of, found at Tell-el-Amarna, i, 249.
Abdil'it, ii, 196.
Abd-milkot, ii, 222, 223.
Abd-ur-rahmar, i, 146.
Abel-Beth-Ma'aka, ii, 129.
Abgar, i, 301.
Abilakka, ii, 126.
Abi-milki of Tyre, letter of, found at Tell-el-Amarna, i, 249.
Abiyate, ii, 276.
Abu-Habba, i, 250; ii, 59.
Abulfeda, i, 100, 101.
Abu (?) makhru, i, 401.
Abu-Shabrein, i, 289.
Acacia i, 282.
Academy, Göttingen, of Sciences, i, 54.
Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres, French, i, 100.
Accad, language of, i, 303; origin of the word, i, 373.
Achaemenides, i, 39, 45.
Adad, ii, 76, 78.
Adad-nirari I, king of Assyria, has war with Nazi-Maruttash, i, 421; conquests, ii, 10; war with Babylonia, ii, 11; success of his reign, ii, 12.
Adad-nirari II, king of Assyria, ii, 44.
Adad-nirari III, king of Assyria, experiments in the west, ii, 96; campaigns in the northeast, north, and south, ii, 97; assimilates religions of Assyria and Babylonia, ii, 98; estimate of his reign, ii, 99, 100; refers to Bel-Kapkunu, ii, 3; synchronistic history made in his reign, i, 413.
Adad-shum-iddin, king of Babylonia, i, 422.
Adad-shum-usur, king of Babylonia, i, 423.
A-dara-kalamu, i, 396.
Adarmalik, ii, 215.
Ademnu, ii, 76.
Adhem, i, 272, 289.
Adumetash, i, 401.
Adunu-Baal, ii, 77.
Affej swamps, i, 244.
Afghanistan, i, 67, 68.
Afrim, ii, 64, 75, 118.
Agade, i, 366, 373.
Agum-kakrime, his connection with Tasbzigurumash, i, 403; an inscription of his reign, i, 403, 404; his royal titles, i, 404; his exploits, i, 405-407.
Agum-shi, i, 401.
Agusi, ii, 114.
Alhasuerns, i, 8.
Ahaz, ii, 126, 128.
Aiibur-shabu, ii, 346.
Ain Tab, ii, 60.
Akerkuf, i, 296.
Akh-en-Aton, i, 248.
Akhimiti, ii, 169.
Akhiyababa, ii, 51.
Akhuni, ii, 74.
Akurgal, i, 357.
Akurgal II, i, 371.
A-kur-ul-anna, i, 396.
Alabaster, i, 288.
Alarodian, i, 220.
Alexander, i, 141.
Alexander, son of Alexander the Great, i, 329.
Alexander the Great, i, 15, 328, 331.
Aleppo, ii, 41, 76, 78.
Aljuba, i, 13.
Almond, i, 282.
Altaqu, battle of, ii, 198.
Altibari, i, 219.
Alusharshid, i, 359.
Alvan, i, 404.
Amamus, Mount, i, 370; ii, 12.
Amaran El, i, 249.
Amardian, i, 179.
Amarna, Dér el, i, 249.
Amarna, Tell-el-, discovery of letters at, i, 248, 249.
Amasis, ii, 339, 340.
Ambaridi, ii, 167.
Ambaris, ii, 167.
Amenophis III, letters from Kadashman-Bel, i, 415; his wives from Babylonia, i, 416.
Amenophis IV, i, 248, 249; letters from Burnaburiash II, i, 418; letter from Asshurnaballit, ii, 8.
Amid, ii, 40.
Amil-Marduk, king of Babylonia, shows mercy to Jehoiachin, ii, 354; his brief reign and assassination, ii, 355.
Ammisadugga, i, 395; chronological tablet from his reign, i, 313.
Ammisatum, i, 395.
Ammuladi, ii, 276.
Ammunu, kingdom of, i, 378; title used by Shamash-shum-ukin, i, 378.
Amraphel, i, 389. See also Hammurabi.
Anbar, i, 240.
Aniran, i, 43.
An-ma-an, i, 396.
Annals, Babylonian, as sources, i, 255.
Anquetil-Duperron, Abraham Hyacinthe, early life, visit to India, i, 41; published Zend-Avesta, i, 42, 55, 66.
Antiochia Mygdonia, i, 300.
Anu-banini, i, 360.

Anzan-Shushinak, i, 390.
 Anzitene, ii, 85.
 Aphek, ii, 322.
 Apil-Sin, i, 388, 395.
 Apirak, i, 366.
 Apollodoros, i, 260.
 Apple, i, 282.
 Apre, ii, 64, 65.
 Apricot, i, 282.
 Arabie, i, 10, 14, 139.
 Arabian Nights, i, 138.
 Arameans, original home, and later development in the west, ii, 40, 41, 46.
 Arame, ii, 76, 84, 85.
 Aram-Naharaim, i, 269.
 Aram, plateau of, i, 267.
 Araxes, i, 12, 119.
 Arbaflu, i, 299.
 Arban, ii, 51.
 Arbela, ii, 49, 85.
 Archaeological evidence for chronology, i, 322.
 Argana, ii, 76, 77.
 Argistis, i, 218; ii, 113.
 Argistis II, ii, 166.
 Aribua, ii, 65.
 Ariduri, i, 219.
 Arimena, i, 219.
 Arioch, i, 391. See also Eri-Aku.
 Armenia, i, 266.
 Armenian, i, 10.
 Arne, ii, 86.
 Arpad, ii, 118, 120, 155.
 Arpakha, ii, 102.
 Arrapachitis, ii, 102.
 Arrasnis, i, 218.
 Arrian, i, 265.
 Arsamas, ii, 84, 85.
 Artaxerxes, i, 8.
 Artemisia, i, 8.
 Artsen, i, 219.
 Arvad, ii, 67.
 Arzania, ii, 241.
 Arzashku, ii, 85.
Ash, the Kassite termination, i, 412.
 Ashdod, ii, 124.
 Asher, i, 87.
 Ashmumnak, i, 404.
 Asnapper, ii, 246. See also Asshurbanapal.
 Ass, i, 283.
 Ass, wild, i, 285.
 Asshur (city), i, 297; ii, 3; capital transferred, ii, 13; rebuilt by Tiglath-pileser I, ii, 30, 76, 102.
 Asshur (god), i, 298.
 Asshurbanapal, king of Assyria, authorities for his reign, ii, 246; character of his annals, ii, 247, 248; expedition into Egypt, ii, 249-251; the rebellion under Tanut-Amon, ii, 252, 253; the control of Egypt, ii, 253, 254; the fall of Tyre, ii, 255, 257; campaign against Man, ii, 257, 258; difficulties with Elam, ii, 258-260; conquest of the Gambuli, ii, 260; the rebellion of Shamash-shum-ukin, ii, 261-268; punishment of Chaldeans and Elamites, ii, 269-274; campaigns in Arabia, ii, 274-276; the last campaigns, ii, 277, 278; works of peace, ii, 278-279; estimate of his reign, ii, 279-282; his identity with Kandalanu, ii, 297, 298; allusion to Kudur-nankhundi, i, 319.
 Asshur-bel-kala, king of Assyria, ii, 31; transferred capital to Nineveh, ii, 33.
 Asshur-bel-nisheshu, king of Assyria, ii, 5; contemporary of Kara-indash, ii, 5; his reign, ii, 5, 6; synchronistic history begins in his reign, i, 324.
 Asshurdan, referred to by Tiglath-pileser I, i, 326; in conflict with Babylonians, i, 424; king of Assyria, ii, 18.
 Asshurdan II, king of Assyria, ii, 44.
 Asshurdan III, king of Assyria, decay of Assyrian power, ii, 101; rebellions, ii, 102; eclipse of the sun, 102.
 Asshur-daninani, ii, 112.
 Asshur-dayan, ii, 73.
 Asshur-erbi, king of Assyria, ii, 43; invades the west, ii, 44.
 Asshur-til-il-ukinni, king of Assyria, records of his reign, ii, 283; his palace at Calah, ii, 283; text of, found at Niffer, i, 241.
 Asshur-iqisha, ii, 118.
 Asshur-ilⁱ, ii, 161.
 Asshur-nadin-akhe, king of Assyria, contemporary of Kurigalzu I, i, 417; ii, 6, 43.
 Asshur-nadin-shum, ii, 206.
 Asshur-narara, king of Assyria, ii, 17.
 Asshurnazirpal I, king of Assyria, ii, 17.
 Asshurnazirpal II, king of Assyria, ii, 43.
 Asshurnazirpal III, king of Assyria, his prospects, ii, 46; sources for his reign, ii, 47; receives tribute from Kirruri, Gozan, and Khubushkia, conquers Qurkhi of Beitan, ii, 49; invasion of Kummukh, ii, 50; conquers Bit-Khalupe, ii, 51, 52; campaigns in the north, ii, 52; rebuilds city of Tuskhia, ii, 53; revolts on the east and south, ii, 54; his collection of tribute, ii, 55, 56; attacks upon the Shuhites and Babylonians, ii, 57, 58; revolts of Shuhites and their conquest, ii, 59, 60; takes Kap-rabi, ii, 61; his success over former tributary states, ii, 62; the use of his army, ii, 63; beginning of western campaign, ii, 63, 64; the march through Patin, ii, 65; effect of this expedition, ii, 66; receives tribute from Phoenicians, ii, 67, 68; ravages in Kummukh, ii, 69; works of peace, ii, 69, 70; estimate of his reign, ii, 71.
 Asshurnirari II, king of Assyria, ii, 103; estimate of his weak reign, ii, 104.
 Asshur-irish-ish, king of Assyria, ii,

19; war with Nebuchadrezzar, i, 429, ii, 19.

Asshur-uballit, king of Assyria, his invasion of Babylonia, ii, 7; campaign against the Shubari, ii, 7; letter to Amenophis IV, ii, 8; found at Tell-el-Amarna, i, 249; his daughter marries Karakhardash, King of Babylonia, i, 419.

Assyria, boundaries of, i, 268, 269; beginnings of, i, 409; chronology of, i, 346-348.

Assyrian chronological material, i, 323.

Assyrian Exploration Fund, i, 162.

Assyrians, origin in Babylonia, ii, 1; a military and commercial people, i, 308; civilization inferior to Babylonians, i, 309; progress to the end of the reign of Tukulti-Ninib, ii, 15, 16.

Assyrium Stagnum, i, 276.

Aston, i, 76.

Arthur, lieutenant of Nimrod, i, 141.

Attila, ii, 55.

Attametu, i, 401.

Atun, ii, 157.

Augustinian society established in Persia, i, 8.

Aurmazda, i, 54.

Avestan, i, 44.

Aza, ii, 160.

Azariah, king of Judah, i, 87; ii, 119, 120; name identified on Assyrian text, i, 228.

Azuri, ii, 169.

B.

Baal worshiped in early Babylonia, i, 350.

Baal of Tyre, ii, 227.

Baasha, ii, 77.

Babelat-khigal, ii, 71.

Babir, i, 204.

Babylon, i, 88, 89, 91, 138, 294; ii, 133, 136; origin of the city unknown, i, 386; chronology of eighth dynasty, i, 345; destruction of, ii, 211; defenses of, the account of Herodotus, ii, 389-391; the account left by Nebuchadrezzar, ii, 392-395.

Babylonia and Assyria, boundaries of, i, 266, 267.

Babylonian Chronicle A (or S), i, 314, 396, 397.

Babylonian Chronicle B, i, 314.

Babylonian Chronicle P, i, 315.

Babylonian chronological materials, i, 312.

Babylonian people, devoted to religion and literature, i, 308; their civilization superior to the Assyrian, i, 309.

Bagdatti, ii, 160.

Baghdad, i, 86, 131, 140, 142, 145, 153, 277.

Bahr-i-Nedjif, i, 277.

Balasu, ii, 135, 220.

Balawat, i, 235, 271.

Balbi, Gasparo, i, 97.

Balikb, i, 271, 300; ii, 76, 78, 151.

Bandamir, i, 12.

Barbaro, Josophat, sent to court of Uzun Cassan, i, 6; account of visit to Camara, i, 6, 7. His narrative not much better than Odoric's, i, 7.

Barbel, i, 283.

Bassorah, i, 153.

Bau-akh-iddin, ii, 97, 108.

Baz, ii, 351.

Bazi, chronology of dynasty of, i, 344; history of, ii, 36.

Beans, i, 282.

Beauchamp, describes mounds at Hillah, i, 106, 107; an abbé and a man of learning, i, 108; observes a resemblance between Persepolis and Babylonian characters, i, 108; his work makes considerable impression in Europe, 109.

Beaver, i, 285.

Beer, i, 61, 83.

Behistun i, 177.

Beirut, ii, 44.

Bel, i, 293, 295; temple of, i, 96, 97.

Bel-bani, early ruler of Assyria, ii, 3, 4.

Belék, Waldemar, important work on Chaldean texts, i, 224; travels in Armenia, i, 224.

Belésys, ii, 134.

Bel-etri, ii, 260.

Bel-ibni, ii, 205.

Bel-Kapaku, ruler of Assyria, ii, 3.

Bel-kudur-usur, king of Assyria, ii, 18; in conflict with Babylonia, i, 423.

Bellino, secretary to C. J. Rieh, i, 122; visits Babylon with Porter, i, 122.

Bel-nadin-apli, king of Babylonia, i, 427; boundary stone, i, 316.

Bel-nirari, king of Assyria, relations with Babylonia, i, 420, ii, 8; conquests and war with Babylonia, ii, 9.

Bel-shar-usur, ii, 162. See also Bel-shazzar.

Belshazzar, regent of Babylonia, ii, 363; with the army in Accad, ii, 375.

Bel-shum-uddin, king of Babylonia, i, 422, 424.

Bel-shum-ishkun, ii, 356.

Bend-i-Nuh, i, 361.

Ben-Hadad II, ii, 75, 77, 80, 81, 116, 206.

Benjamin of Tudela, went to the Orient, i, 85; visits and describes Mosul, i, 85, 86; visits Baghdad, i, 86; describes ruins of Babylon, i, 86, 87; his narrative printed in 1543, i, 88.

Berber, i, 306.

Berossos, a Babylonian priest, i, 258, 259; wrote work on Babylonian history, i, 259; the transmission of this book, i, 259, 260; chronological tables, i, 327, 328, 332.

Bey, i, 145.

Bezold, Carl, opposes Halévy's view, i, 212; discovers mention of Sumerian language, i, 214.

Bibeashi, i, 401.

Biberashu, king of Babylonia, i, 422.

Biblical Archaeology, Society of formed, i, 198, 199.
 Bingani-shar-ali, son of Naram-Sin, i, 367.
 Birch, Samuel, first president of Society of Biblical Archaeology, i, 198; calls attention of George Smith to Cyproite, i, 228; makes address before Society of Biblical Archaeology, i, 230.
 Birdashu, ii, 123.
 Birejik, ii, 60.
 Biris-Khadri, ii, 258.
 Birs Nimroud, i, 165, 172, 295.
 Bisharee, i, 306.
 Bishri, Mount, ii, 28.
 Bit-Adini, ii, 60, 61, 74.
 Bit-Amukkani, ii, 304.
 Bit-Dakkuri, ii, 174, 220, 304.
 Bit-Imbi, ii, 271.
 Bit-Khalupe, ii, 49, 51, 57.
 Bit-Khamban, ii, 87.
 Bit-Khirmam, ii, 162.
 Bit-Sagbat, ii, 162.
 Bit-Sumurzu, ii, 112.
 Bit-Umargi, ii, 162.
 Bitumen, i, 288; pits, i, 289.
 Bit-Yakin, ii, 176, 181.
 Blackbird, i, 283.
 Black Sea, ii, 29.
 Boeriah, i, 79.
 Bohrān, ii, 26.
 Bokkhoris, ii, 164.
 Bonomi, Joseph, i, 198.
 Boré, Eugène, 167.
 Borsippa, i, 295; ii, 111, 135.
 Boscawen, W. St. Chad, appointed in British Museum, i, 234.
 Botta, Paul Emile, is appointed French consul at Mosul, i, 127; searches Mosul for inscriptions in vam, i, 130; begins to dig at Kuyunjik, i, 31; not much success, i, 132; determines to try digging at Khor-sabad, i, 132; important discoveries made there, i, 134; difficulties, i, 134; ordered to cease work, i, 135; permitted to resume, i, 136; complete success, i, 137; antiquities taken to Paris, i, 137; publishes a memoir on his discoveries, i, 185; deciphers some words, i, 186.
 Boulanik, ii, 48.
 Boundaries of Babylonia and Assyria, i, 266, 267.
 Boundary stone of Bel-nadin-apli, i, 316.
 Bread from palm tree, i, 283.
 Bricks, manufacture of, i, 286, 287.
 Brown, Francis, member of Oriental Society, i, 239.
 Bruin, Cornelis de, visits Persepolis and copies inscriptions, i, 31.
 Bubu, ii, 49.
 Budge, E. A. Wallis, bought part of Tell-el-Amarna collection, i, 249; repeated visits to Orient, i, 252.
 Buduhu, ii, 196.
 Burnaburiash I, contemporary of Puzur-Asshur, i, 416; a great builder, i, 417.
 Burnaburiash II becomes king of Babylon about 1400 B. C., i, 418; letters of his to Amenophis IV, i, 418.
 Burnouf, Eugène, studies linguistic collections of Anquetil-Duperron, i, 42; gives Avestan grammar a scientific basis, i, 59; finds list of countries in inscription of Naksh-i-Rustam, i, 59; his position, i, 62, 66, 67; correspondence with Rawlinson, i, 69; attempts to decipher Flower's copies, i, 81.
 Bur-Sin I, i, 376.
 Bur-Sin II, i, 377.
 Bustard, i, 283.
 Buwarije, El, i, 292.

C.

Calah, i, 297, 298; ii, 13, 106, 180.
 Callisthenes, i, 331.
 Camel, i, 284.
 Campaign inscriptions as sources, i, 255.
 Canaanite names in first dynasty of Babylon, i, 395.
 Canal system, i, 275.
 Canning, Sir Stratford, i, 143.
 Cantémur, Dimitri, i, 80.
 Carchemish, ii, 41, 64, 76, 86, 93, 114, 119, 121, 157.
 Carmel, i, 4.
 Carp, i, 283.
 Carreri, see Gemelli-Carreri.
 Carrhae, i, 301.
 Cartwright, John, i, 90; description of Nineveh, i, 94, 95; hears of the garden of Eden near Babylon, i, 95; confuses Baghdad and Babylon, i, 96.
 Cataonia, ii, 29.
 Cavaua, i, 13.
 Caylus vase, i, 180.
 Ceylon, i, 139.
 Chahelminar, i, 75.
 Chaldean, old, i, 203.
 Chialdians, origin and racial connections, i, 310; their early development, i, 311; process of their development, ii, 300-303.
 Chaldia, ii, 83, 123, 166.
 Chaldian texts copied and deciphered, i, 215-224. See also Vannic.
 Cham, see Ham.
 Chardin, Sir John, born in 1643, i, 24; visit to Persepolis, i, 24; copied inscriptions, i, 24; his copies confirm previous suppositions, i, 25, 107.
 Chebar, ii, 319.
 Chedorlaomer, king of Elam, invades the west, i, 381; identification of the west, i, 390.
 Chelminira, i, 8, 75.
 Chick-peas, i, 282.
 Choaspes, i, 94.
 Chosser, i, 128, 129.
 Chronicle, Babylonian, A (or S), i, 314.
 Chronicle, Babylonian, B, i, 314.
 Chronicle, Babylonian, P, i, 315.

Chronicle, Nabonidus, i, 315.
 Chronological material, Assyrian, i, 323.
 Chronological materials, Babylonian, i, 312.
 Chronology, tables of, i, 336-348.
 Chronological Tablet of Dynasty I, i, 313.
 Chsharsha, see Xerxes.
 Civilization in early Babylonia, i, 350.
 Comana, ii, 29.
 Conglomerate, i, 288.
 Constantinople, i, 135, 142, 143, 156.
 Cooper, F., i, 157.
 Cooper, W. R., i, 198.
 Cordier, Henri, i, 5.
 Cotton, Sir Dodmore, English ambassador to Persia, i, 18; landed at Gombrun, i, 18, died at Casbin, i, 18.
 Cranes, i, 283.
 Croesus, ii, 372.
 Crusades reawaken European interest in the Orient, i, 85.
 Cuneiform, the word used by Hyde, i, 78.
 Cureton, Rev. W., i, 196.
 Cypress, i, 282.
 Cypriote, attempts to decipher, i, 228.
 Cyprus, ii, 178.
 Cyrus, king of Anshan, ii, 370; king of the Manda, ii, 371; king of the Persians, ii, 371; extent of his empire, ii, 372; defeats Croesus, ii, 372, 373; his army in Babylonia ii, 376; takes Babylon, ii, 378.

Derbent, i, 79, 80.
 Dew, i, 279.
 Diarbekir, ii, 24, 49, 52.
 Dilbat, ii, 351.
 Dilmun, ii, 177.
 Diwaniyeh, i, 273.
 Diyalech, i, 272.
 Down, County, i, 70.
 Dream of Assurbanapal, ii, 271.
 Dublin, i, 71.
 Ducks, i, 283.
 Dunanu, ii, 260.
 Dungi I, i, 291, 373; his buildings in different cities, i, 375.
 Dungi II, i, 377.
 Dur-Asshur, ii, 55.
 Dur-Atkhara, ii, 174.
 Durdukka, ii, 156.
 Dur-ilu, ii, 153.
 Dur-Kurigalzu, i, 296; ii, 109.
 Dur-Ladina, ii, 175.
 Dur-Nabu, ii, 174.
 Dur-Papsukal, ii, 95.
 Dur-Sharrukin, i, 299; ii, 162.
 Dur-Tukulti-apal-esarra, ii, 110.
 Dur-Undasi, ii, 271.
 Dushi, i, 401.
 Dushratta, letter of, found at Tell-el-Amarna, i, 249.
 Dust storms, i, 278.

D.

Dadda-idri, see Ben-Hadad II.
 Daily Telegraph, proprietors of, send George Smith to Assyria, i, 231; discovery of further deluge tablets, i, 231, 232.
 Daiuku, ii, 162, 163.
 Dalta, ii, 167.
 Damascus, ii, 41, 75, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 96, 101, 119, 121, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 133, 139, 155.
 Dam-ki-ilu-shu, i, 396.
 Daniel, i, 87.
 Danube, i, 271.
 D'Anville, writes paper on the site of Babylon, i, 101; attempts to prove that Baghdad is not Babylon, i, 103.
 Darayavahush, see Darius.
 Darheush, see Darius.
 Darius, i, 52, 60, 65, 66, 69.
 David, ii, 43.
 Dayaeni, ii, 113.
 Dayan-Asshur, ii, 75, 86, 88.
 Dean of St. Paul's, i, 196.
 Deecke, W., i, 210.
 Delitzsch, Friedrich, uses the word Accadian rather than Sumerian, i, 206; contributes some explanations of syllabaries, i, 206; at first opposes Halévy's view concerning Sumerian i, 209; later accepts

E.

Ea-ga-mil, i, 396.
 Eagles, i, 283.
 Ea-mukin-zer, king of Babylonia, ii, 36.
 E-Anna, i, 292.
 Eannatum defeats Semites and sets up a great commemorative stele, i, 357, 358.
 Early Babylonia, chronology of, i, 337, 338.
 East India Company, orders search made for Babylonian inscriptions, i, 110; examination of the inscriptions thus found, i, 113; has Rich in its service, i, 113; museum visited by Mohl, i, 126; makes a survey of Nineveh district, i, 171.
 E-babbara, ii, 364.
 Ebishum, i, 395.
 Edubar, i, 387.
 Eclipse of the sun, i, 324; ii, 102.
 Eel, i, 283.
 Egg plants, i, 282.
 Egyptian inscriptions as sources, for chronology, i, 335; for history, i, 257.
 Eighth dynasty, chronology of, i, 345.
 E-kharsag-kurkura, i, 297.
 E-khulkhul, ii, 367.
 Ekron, ii, 124, 194.
 Ekur, i, 364, 365, 420.

Elam, i, 266; chronology of dynasty of, i, 344.
 Elamite king of Babylonia, ii, 36.
 Elath, ii, 128.
 Eldred, John, visits Orient, i, 89; describes tower of Babel, i, 90; confuses Baghdad and Babylon, i, 91.
 Elephant, i, 284.
 Eleutheros, ii, 65.
 Ellipi, ii, 190.
 Elmantine, i, 272.
 Elulaeus, ii, 146, 195.
 Eu-anna-tunna I, i, 358.
 Eu-anna-tuma II, i, 358.
 Eu-anna-tuma, i, 376.
 Eni-el, ii, 154.
 Enilu, ii, 121.
 Enne-Ugun, king of Kish, conquered by Sumerians, i, 354.
 Eu-shag-kush-ana, lord of Kengi, i, 351; his kingdom, i, 352, 353.
 Enzi, ii, 93.
 Eparna, ii, 237.
 Eponym, i, 323.
 Erba-Adad, king of Assyria, ii, 43.
 Erbil, i, 300.
 Ereh, i, 161, 291, 375.
 Eri-Aku, king of Larsa, i, 381; his titles, i, 382; identity with Arioch, i, 391.
 Eridu, i, 289, 290.
 Erzerum, i, 160.
 Es-agila, i, 295; ii, 350, 353, 363.
 Esarhaddon, king of Assyria, authorizes for his reign ii, 216; beginning of his reign, ii, 217; overcomes rebels, ii, 218; begins to rebuild Babylon, ii, 218, 219; war with Chaldean tribes, ii, 220, 221; refusal to pay tribute in the west, ii, 222, 223; first westward campaign, ii, 223-228; determination to attack Egypt, ii, 228; conquest of Egypt, ii, 229-231; raids in Arabia, ii, 231-233; Indo-European invasions, ii, 233-236; campaign in Media, 336, 337; movements of the Indo-Europeans, ii, 238, 239; his last campaigns ii, 240-242; difficulties and greatness of his reign, ii, 244-245; vandal treatment of inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser III, ii, 106-107; claims descent from Bel-bani, ii, 34.
 Esdraelon, ii, 5, 129.
 E-shid-lam, i, 296.
 Eski-Mosul, i, 100, 101.
 Ethiopia, ii, 128.
 Ethobal, ii, 195, 222.
 Eulbar, i, 365; ii, 365.
 Eulbar-shakin-shum, king of Babylonia, ii, 36.
 Euphrates, ii, 57, 64, 76; source of the river, i, 270; its course, i, 270, 271.
 E-ur-imim-an-ki, ii, 349.
 Evil-merodach, see Amil-Marduk.
 Expedition Lists, Assyrian, i, 324.
 Ezekiel, i, 259.
 Ezida, i, 295, 350, 353, 363.

F.

Fancher, M. Leon, i, 165.
 Felugia, i, 89, 90.
 Felujah, i, 273.
 Fertility of Babylonia, i, 279, 280, 281.
 Field, Perez Hastings, architect of first Pennsylvania expedition to Babylonia.
 Fifth dynasty of Babylon, chronology of, i, 344.
 Fig, i, 282.
 First dynasty of Babylon, chronology of, i, 338.
 Flandin, E., 136.
 Flower, i, 24, 33; copies of Persepolis inscriptions, i, 74; the languages in them, i, 76, 77; these copies produce a retrograde movement, i, 77; come into the hands of Groteweld, i, 82.
 Fourth dynasty, chronology of, i, 342-344.
 Fresnel, Fulgence, i, 165.

G
 Gabres, i, 75, 79.
 Gaddash, i, 401, 402.
 Galilee, ii, 129.
 Galla, i, 306.
 Gal'za, ii, 126.
 Gambuji, ii, 174.
 Gamil-Sin, i, 377.
 Gan, i, 401.
 Gande, i, 401, 402.
 Gandish, i, 401.
 Gardikan, ii, 51.
 Gasparo Balbi, i, 97.
 Gaures, i, 75, 79.
 Gaza, ii, 124, 125.
 Gebal, ii, 119, 121.
 Gedaliah, ii, 333.
 Geese, i, 283.
 Geere, architect of fourth campaign at Niffer, i, 245.
 Genelli-Carri, Giovanni Francesco, sets out on journey round the world, i, 25; visits Persepolis, i, 26; description of the ruins, i, 26, 27; his copies of inscriptions, i, 28; they are shown not to be original, i, 28; his picture of platform at Persepolis also borrowed, i, 28; doubt as to whether he made the trip at all not justified, i, 29.
 Genealogical details useful for chronology, i, 322.
 Georgian, i, 220.
 German expedition in Babylonia, i, 247, 248.
 German Orient Society, i, 246, 247.
 Ghalalamu, i, 371.
 Giammu, ii, 76.
 Gilhiagin, i, 86.
 Gilead, ii, 129.
 Gilzan, ii, 77.
 Girkishar, i, 316.
 Girsu, i, 291.
 Gladstone, W. E., i, 198; address before Society of Biblical Archaeology, i, 230.

Goat, i, 283.
 Gobryas, ii, 378 .
 Gog, ii, 258.
 Göljik, i, 270.
 Gombo lentils, i, 282.
 Gop, ii, 48.
 Goshaspas, see Hystaspes.
 Göttingen Academy of Sciences, i, 54.
 Gouvea, Antonio de, Augustinian friar, sent as missionary to Persia, i, 7; tries to induce Abbas to make war on the Turks, i, 7; visits Persepolis, i, 8-10; his account better than that of Odoric or Barbaro, i, 11.
 Gozam, ii, 49, 151.
 Graf, Theodor, i, 249.
 Greek writers as sources for history, i, 258.
 Griffins, i, 18.
 Groats, i, 283.
 Gronau, i, 21.
 Grote, i, 196.
 Grotefend, Georg Friedrich, born at Münden, i, 46; studied at Ilfeld and Göttingen, i, 46; publishes his first work, i, 47; induced to study Persepolis inscriptions, i, 47; attempts to decipher them, using "b" and "g" texts of Niebuhr, i, 48; identifies the expression "king of kings," i, 49; finds the word *son*, i, 51; begins to search for kings' names, i, 51; the names Darius and Xerxes identified, i, 52; the name of Hystaspes, i, 53; translates inscriptions in part, i, 54; publishes his results, i, 55; later work largely abortive, i, 57; his position, i, 62; sees Flower's copies, i, 82.
 Grünwald, Moritz, i, 210.
 Gubbe, ii, 48.
 Gudea, patesi of Shirpurla, i, 368; his great building operations, i, 369, 370; his conquests, i, 370; civilization, i, 370, 371.
 Guldendorf, i, 81.
 Gulkishar, i, 316, 396.
 Gulis, i, 283.
 Gungunu, i, 377.
 Gurgum, ii, 121.
 Garnard, i, 283.
 Gusi, ii, 76.
 Guti, i, 404.
 Gutium, ii, 9, 10.
 Guyard, Stanislas, begins to decipher Vanne (Chaldian), i, 221; reviews the work of Sayce, i, 223; supports Halévy, i, 211.
 Guyashi, i, 401.
 Guzann, ii, 102, 151.
 Guzuman, ii, 189.

H.

Hadiseh i, 272.
 Hadrian, i, 300.
 Hager, Joseph, writes important book on Babylonian inscriptions, i, 110; connects the Babylonian inscrip- tions with the Persepolis texts i, 111; the great influence of his book, i, 112.
 Halebe, ii, 50.
 Halebiyah, El, ii, 60.
 Halévy, Joseph, writes a series of papers denying the existence of the Sumerian language, i, 207; his brilliant presentation of his case, i, 208; his position sharply attacked, i, 209; replies to his critics, i, 210; wins some adherents, i, 211.
 Haheimnassus, i, 143.
 Hall Bey, i, 250.
 Hall, Isaac H., member of American Oriental Society, i, 239.
 Ham, i, 9.
 Hamadan, i, 63, 139.
 Hamath, ii, 41, 75, 79, 81, 119, 121, 139, 154.
 Hamdy Bey, i, 250.
 Hamilton, Alexander, i, 97.
 Hammam, i, 160.
 Hammam Ali, i, 141.
 Hammurabi, king of Babylon, his reign begins a new era, i, 388; unifies all Babylonia, i, 388, 389; his identity with Anraphel, i, 389; inscription concerning canal, i, 391; his buildings in Babylon and Borsippa, i, 392, 393; the glory of his reign, i, 393; his later influence, i, 397; tablets of, found at Sippar, i, 251; restores temple in Larsa, i, 291.
 Hananiah, i, 87.
 Hanno, ii, 124, 128, 155, 156.
 Harper, Robert F., Assyriologist of first Pennsylvania expedition, i, 240.
 Harpoot, see Kharpoot.
 Hauran, i, 300, 367, 368.
 Hatshepsowet, ruler of Egypt, ii, 4.
 Haupt, P., important book on Sumerian family laws, i, 211.
 Hawran, the, ii, 82.
 Hawks, i, 283.
 Haynes, J. H., member of Wolfe expedition, i, 239; business manager of first Pennsylvania expedition, i, 241; also of second campaign, i, 242; director of third campaign, i, 243; manager of fourth campaign, i, 245.
 Hazael, ii, 81, 82, 83.
 Hazor, ii, 129.
 Hebrew, i, 10, 14.
 Hebrew bowls, found at Niffer, i, 241.
 Hebrews, development of their power in Palestine, ii, 42, 43.
 Hella, see Hillah.
 Herbert, Thomas, member of suite of Sir D. Cotton, i, 18; account of visit to Persepolis, i, 18, 19; later description, i, 20-23; copy of inscription, i, 23; small influence of his copies, i, 24.
 Herodotus, place of his birth and his early training, i, 263; the value of his history, i, 263, 264; Sayce's

criticism, i, 263; on fertility of Babylonia, i, 280, 281.

Hermon, ii, 82.

Herons, i, 282.

Hezekiah, ii, 169, 188, 194.

Hieroglyphic Egyptian texts as sources, i, 257.

Hillah, i, 87, 107, 130, 158, 273, 294.

Hilprecht, Hermann V., Assyriologist on first Pennsylvania expedition, i, 240; director of museum in Philadelphia, i, 243; director of fourth campaign in Babylonia, i, 245; his distinguished services, i, 246.

Hincks, Edward, born at Cork, i, 71; educated at Trinity College, i, 71; won gold medal, i, 71; settled at Killyleagh, i, 71; studied mathematics and later published Hebrew grammar, i, 71; it is not known when he first studied Persepolis inscriptions, i, 71; worked independently of Rawlinson at first, i, 71; first memoir, i, 71; works on Assyrian, i, 176; reads papers thereon before Royal Irish Academy, i, 182; makes a great contribution to the subject, i, 187; makes a translation, i, 187, 188; circulates a paper on Assyrian verb forms at British Association, i, 192; publishes a list of characters, i, 193; translates cylinder of Tiglathpileser, i, 196; puts forth hypothesis that cuneiform script was invented by Indo-Europeans, i, 201; explains certain peculiarities of Accadian language, i, 202, 203; uses name Old Chaldean instead of Accadian, i, 203; makes much progress in deciphering Chaldean language, i, 218, 219.

Hindiye, i, 273.

Hirom, ii, 121.

Hit, i, 272.

Hittites, ii, 54, 96.

Hog, i, 284.

Holwan, i, 404; ii, 88, 89.

Holzmann, Adolf, i, 62; offers a translation of Flower's copies, i, 83.

Honey, i, 283.

Hophra, ii, 320.

Horse, i, 284.

Hoshea, king of Israel, name identified on Assyrian text, i, 228; ii, 129, 140, 144, 145.

Hunger, influence of, in early conquest, i, 351.

Huz, i, 3.

Hyde, Thomas, publishes book on religion of the Persians, i, 77; reproduces Flower's copies, and calls the method of writing cuneiform, i, 78.

Hyena, i, 285.

Hystaspes, i, 53, 65.

I.

Ibex, i, 285.

Ice, i, 279.

Ignorance of Babylon and Nineveh before 1820, i, 1.

Igur-Kapkapu, ruler of Assyria, ii, 2.

Ijon, ii, 129.

Ilu-Adad, ii, 51.

Ihubani, ii, 52.

Il'ubidi, ii, 154, 155.

Imgur-Bel, ii, 343.

Immeru, i, 387.

Inda-bigash, ii, 270.

Iqbi-Bel, ii, 174, 176.

Iran, i, 43.

Iranzu, ii, 157, 159.

Irishum, ruler of Assyria, ii, 2.

Irkhulima, ii, 75, 76, 77, 80.

Irzah, i, 272.

Isaiah, i, 84, 258; ii, 128, 191.

Isbun, i, 219.

Ishakku, title of early Assyrian rulers, ii, 2; the beginnings of early Assyrian Ishakke, i, 409.

Ishbigarra, i, 376.

Ish-ki-bal, i, 396.

Ishmael, ii, 333.

Ishme-Dagan, i, 376; ii, 2; referred to by Tiglathpileser I, i, 326.

Ishpakai, ii, 234.

Ishpuinish, i, 218.

Ishtar, i, 292, 365; the Ishtar gate of Babylon, ii, 344.

I-sin, i, 203; history of the dynasty of, i, 425-429; chronology of the dynasty, i, 342-344.

Ismail Pasha, i, 145.

Isoglu, i, 217.

Ispabara, ii, 190.

Israel, ii, 75, 79, 127, 129, 131.

Issus, Gulf of, ii, 29.

It'amar, ii, 164.

Itti, ii, 161.

Itti-Bel, i, 364.

Izdubar (Gilgamesh), i, 229.

J.

Janoah, ii, 129.

Jacquet, i, 61.

Jeconiah (Jehoiachin), ii, 318.

Jehoahaz, ii, 312.

Jehoiachin, ii, 318.

Jehoiakim, ii, 312, 317.

Jehu, i, 227; ii, 81, 82.

Jensen, P., opposes Halévy, i, 212.

Jerabis (Jerablus), ii, 64.

Jeremiah, i, 259; ii, 322, 323.

Jerusalem, ii, 199-201, 204.

Jonah, i, 129.

Jones, Felix, surveys the Nineveh district, i, 171.

Jordan, ii, 128.

Josiah defeated and killed at Megiddo, ii, 311.

Jotham, ii, 126.

Judah, ii, 125, 128.

K.

Kadashman-Bel, his reign, i, 414, 415; letters to Amenophis III, i, 415; relations with Egypt, i, 416; building operations, i, 417.

Kadashman-Buriash, king of Babylonia, contemporary of Shalmaneser I, i, 421.

Kadashman-Kharbe I, king of Babylonia, conducts a campaign against the Sutu, i, 419; killed in a rebellion, i, 419.

Kadashman-Kharbe II, king of Babylonia, i, 422.

Kadashman-Turgu, king of Babylonia, i, 421.

Kaempfer, Engelrech, German naturalist, studied botany in Japan, i, 29; copied inscriptions at Persepolis, i, 30.

Kaisariyeh, ii, 10.

Kaiz, ii, 67.

Kahab Shergat, i, 156, 158, 297.

Kaldi, geography of the land of, i, 268.

Kaldū, i, 310; ii, 58. See also Chaldean.

Kallima-Sin, i, 414. See also Kadashman-Bel.

Kalueh, ii, 120.

Kalparuda, ii, 76.

Kammusunadab, ii, 196.

Kandalanu, king of Babylonia, his identity with Assurbanapal, ii, 297, 298.

Kannubanini (Anubanini), i, 361.

Kap-rabi, ii, 61.

Karadash, inscription of his, i, 412; relations with Assyria, i, 413; allusion to his reign in synchronistic history, i, 414; synchro-nistic history begins in his reign, i, 324.

Karakhardash, king of Babylonia, marries Muballitat-Sherna, i, 418; no knowledge of his reign, i, 419.

Kara-Sū, i, 271.

Kar-Asshur, ii, 109.

Kar-Asshurnazirpal, ii, 60.

Kardunyash, the country of, i, 421; ii, 58.

Kar Nabu, ii, 162.

Kar-Shulman-asharid (Shalmaneser-burg), ii, 76, 93.

Kasdim, i, 310. See also Chaldean.

Kashtariti, ii, 235.

Kasr, El, mound of, i, 247.

Kasshu, the origin, i, 399; their relationship to Kossaeans, i, 399; and to the Kissians, i, 399; to be called Kassites, i, 400; ii, 190.

Kasshu-nadin-akhe, king of Babylonia, ii, 36.

Kassites, i, 400. See also Kasshu.

Kassite dynasty, chronology of, i, 340-342; history of, i, 398-424.

Keban-Maaden, i, 271.

Kengi, the lands of canals and reeds, i, 351.

Kerkuk, i, 289.

Khabur, i, 272, 274, 300; ii, 50, 57, 60, 102, 151.

Khaiapa, ii, 164.

Khalpu, ii, 115.

Khallu, ruler of Assyria, ii, 2.

Khatluis, ii, 208.

Khalman, ii, 76.

Khalulé, battle of, ii, 210.

Khalzilukha, ii, 52.

Khammtai, ii, 50.

Khana, i, 404.

Khani, i, 404, 406.

Khamunu, ii, 155. See also Hanno.

Kharbisma, ii, 115.

Kharia, ii, 26.

Kharmis, i, 300.

Kharpoot, i, 271, 272.

Kharsag-kalama, ii, 377.

Khatarikka, ii, 101.

Khayani, ii, 76.

Khaznah, i, 172.

Khindanu, ii, 59.

Khindaru, ii, 174.

Khitr, El, i, 273.

Khorsabad, i, 130, 133, 134, 135, 136, 138, 145, 158, 165, 299.

Khubishma, ii, 121.

Khubushkia, ii, 49, 88, 94.

Khula, ii, 52.

Khulle, ii, 167.

Khumbanigash, ii, 153.

Khurbatila, king of Elam, i, 420.

Khurdistan, i, 360.

Kiakki, ii, 157.

Ki-an-ni-bl, i, 396.

Kidney beans, i, 282.

Ki-gal-dara-bar, i, 396.

Kilkhu, ii, 118, 120.

Killyleagh, i, 70, 71.

Kinalia, ii, 118.

King List A, i, 313.

King List B, i, 313.

King List C, i, 313.

Kinnas, i, 218.

Kipkip, ii, 253.

Kirbit, ii, 248.

Kircher, Athanasius, wrote a treatise on the tower of Babel, i, 98; received the first Babylonian antiquity in Europe, i, 98.

Kirkhu, ii, 26.

Kirruri, ii, 48, 49.

Kish, i, 296.

Kishtan, ii, 115.

Kissians, i, 399.

Kitlala, ii, 76.

Klaproth, i, 66, 81.

Kleitarchos, i, 265.

Koldewey, Robert, director of expedition in Babylonia, i, 247.

Koran, i, 148.

Kossavans, i, 399. See also Kasshu.

Ktesias, his early life, i, 261; his history of Persia, i, 261; its value and preservation, i, 262.

Kudr-Bel, king of Babylonia, i, 407, 421.

Kudur-Lagamar, i, 381, 390. See also Chedorlaomer.

Kudur-luhgamar, i, 390.

Kudur-Mabuk, a prince of E-mutbal, i, 381.

Kudur-Nakhkhunte, i, 380.

Kudur-nankhundi, i, 420; makes a raid into Babylonia, i, 380.

Kudur-ninchamar, i, 390.

Kullani, ii, 120.

Kummukh, ii, 23, 32, 45, 50, 56, 69, 76, 78, 114, 115, 119, 121, 177.

Kundashpi, ii, 76.
 Kundu, ii, 225.
 Kunulua, ii, 65.
 Kurdistan, i, 128, 288.
Kurigalzu I, son and successor of Burnaburiash I, i, 417; his reign, i, 417; contemporary of Asshurnadin-akhe of Assyria, i, 417, 418.
Kurigalzu II, king of Babylonia, conquers Elam, i, 420; campaign against Assyria, i, 420.
 Kurnah, i, 273.
 Kushite, i, 306.
 Kushtashpi, ii, 114, 121.
 Kutha, i, 296, 375; ii, 135.
 Kuti, ii, 19.
 Kuyunjik, i, 129, 131, 133, 140, 142, 153, 155, 166, 235, 298.

L.

Labarosoarchodos, see Labashi-Marduk.
Labashi-Marduk, king of Babylonia, ii, 358.
 Labassarachos, see Labashi-Marduk.
 Lagamar, i, 390.
 Lagash, i, 293.
 Lalli, ii, 76.
 Lallukna, ii, 158.
 Lamium, i, 273.
 Laqeqi, ii, 52, 59.
 Larak, ii, 155.
 Larsa, i, 291; ii, 351.
 Lasirab, king of Guti, i, 360.
 Lassen, studies list of names at Nakshi-Rustam, i, 59; discovers syllabic character of Persian, i, 60, 61, 62, 67; corresponds with Rawlinson, i, 69; his work, known to Hineks, i, 71.
 Latin writers as sources of history, i, 258.
 Layard, Austen Henry, born in Paris, i, 138; influenced by reading Rich's journal, i, 138; seeks a career in Ceylon, i, 138; but changes his mind and returns into western Asia, i, 139; visits Kuyunjik and Neby Yunus, i, 140; his account of a visit to Nimroud, i, 140-142; second visit to Mosul, i, 143; receives a small sum from Sir Stratford Canning for excavation and returns to Mosul, i, 143; the night before beginning excavations, i, 144; account of his first excavations, i, 145-152; his skill in narrative and use of biblical comparisons, i, 152; the winged bulls which he found had originally stood at the portals of palace of Shalmaneser I, i, 153; made some attempts on mound of Kuyunjik, i, 153; antiquities presented to British Museum, i, 154; work resumed in 1846, i, 154; assisted by Rassam, i, 154; work remarkably successful, i, 154; discovers obelisk of Shalmaneser II, i, 155; makes discoveries at Kalah Shergat, i, 156; and at Kuyunjik, i, 156; prepares narrative of his work, i, 157; is sent to Constantinople to serve on embassy, i, 157; sent out to Assyria again, i, 157; chief work at Kuyunjik and Neby Yunus, i, 157; discovers palace of Sennacherib, i, 157; conducted excavations at Kalah Shergat, Nimroud, and Khorsabad, i, 158; his books touch the popular heart, i, 159; finds inscriptions at Palu, i, 218; finds Chaldian texts, i, 221; copies Chaldian texts, i, 221.

Lebanon, ii, 66, 120.
 Le Brun, i, 66.

Lehmann, Carl, discusses the Sumerian questions, i, 214; important work on Chaldian texts, i, 224; travels in Armenia, i, 224.

Lenormant gives a scientific treatise on Sumerian grammar, i, 204, 205; papers on people of Accad and the Turanians in Chaldea and in western Asia, i, 205; opposes Halévy, i, 209; attempts to decipher Chaldian, i, 220.

Lentils, i, 282.
 Leopard, i, 285.
 Libe, ii, 48.
 Libit Ishtar, i, 376.
 Libnah, ii, 202.
 Limestone, i, 288.
Limmu (eponym), i, 323.
 Lindl, Ernest, Assyriologist of German expedition to Babylonia, i, 247.

Lion, i, 284.
 Li-tau, ii, 109.

Loewenstein, Isidore de, begins to decipher Assyrian, i, 180; suggests that Assyrian belongs to Semitic family, i, 181.

Loftus, William Kennett, sent out as geologist to the Orient, i, 160; visits mounds in Babylonia, i, 160; account of mound of Hammam, i, 160, 161; carries on excavations at Warka (Erech), i, 161; visits Niffer and Mugheir, i, 161; excavates for Assyrian Exploration Fund, i, 162; sent out to complete Rassam's work, i, 171.

Longperier, Adrien de, translates a brief Assyrian inscription, i, 183.

Lubartha, ii, 65.

Lugal-kigub-nidudu, king of Erech, king of Ur, i, 372, 373.

Lugal-kisaisi, son of Lugalzaggisi, i, 355; his kingdom, i, 356; (2) i, 373.

Lugalushumgal, vassal of Sargon I, i, 367, 368.

Lugalzaggisi text of, found at Niffer, i, 241; conquers Sumertians, i, 354; makes Erech capital and Nippur chief religious center of his kingdom, i, 354; his account of his victories, i, 355; succeeded by Lugal-kisalsi, i, 355.

Lukani, i, 371.

Luli, i, 361; ii, 195.
 Lullume, ii, 26, 122.
 Lulubi, i, 360.
 Lulubini, i, 361.
 Luri, i, 361.
 Lutipris, ii, 85.
 Lynx, i, 285.
 Lyon, D. G., member of American Oriental Society, i, 239.

M.

Magan, i, 366.
 Maiz, ii, 67.
 Makhallat, ii, 67.
 Malatiyeh, i, 270; ii, 22, 54.
 Malik-rammu, ii, 196.
 Man, ii, 159, 160.
 Manda, name of a nomadic people, ii, 288; their attack upon the Assyrians, ii, 289-291; their destruction of Nineveh, ii, 292; their share in Assyrian territory, ii, 294; the development of their power during the reign of Nabonidus, ii, 368-370.
 Mandelslo, J. Albert de, traveled in the East, i, 19; account of inscriptions at Persepolis, i, 20.
 Mandeville, Sir John, i, 89.
 Manishtusu, i, 360.
 Mama, i, 219.
 Map of Nineveh made by Felix Jones, i, 171.
 Marduk, i, 294.
 Marduk-akhe-irba, king of Babylonia, i, 428.
 Marduk-apal-iddin, i, 423.
 Marduk-balatsu-iqbi, ii, 95, 108.
 Marduk-bel-usate, ii, 89, 90.
 Marduk-nadin-akhe, king of Babylonia, i, 427; his wars with Tiglathpileser I, i, 428.
 Marduk-nadin-shum, ii, 89, 90.
 Marduk-shapik-zer-mati, king of Babylonia, i, 428; marries daughter of Asshur-bel-kala, i, 428.
 Marduk-shmm-udammiq, ii, 87.
 Marduk-zakir-shumu, ii, 187.
 Mari, ii, 96.
 Martinet, i, 87.
 Mash from palm trees, i, 283.
 Mashga, ii, 76.
 Masius, Mount, i, 271, 288; ii, 23, 52, 53, 56, 69.
 Matilu, ii, 114.
 Maurepas, Comte de, i, 100.
 Media, ii, 87, 113.
 Mediterranean, ii, 66.
 Megiddo, battle at, under Thutmosis III, ii, 5.
 Meissner, B., Assyriologist of German expedition to Babylonia, i, 247.
 Melam-kur-kur-ra, i, 396.
 Melid, ii, 119, 121.
 Milliduris, i, 218.
 Meli-Shipak, king of Babylonia, i, 423.
 Membij, ii, 60.
 Menahem, ii, 120, 121; ii, 127, 146.
 Menahem of Samsimuruna, ii, 196.
 Merodach, i, 294.

Merodach-baladan, ii, 152, 153, 170, 171, 172, 205; embassy to Hezekiah, ii, 188.
 Meshech, ii, 22.
 Mesopotamia, ii, 132; misuse of the word, i, 269, 270.
 Mihid, ii, 22.
 Millin, A. L., publishes a Babylonian inscription, i, 112.
 Milman, i, 196.
 Minuas, i, 218.
 Mishael, i, 87.
 Mita, ii, 163, 168, 178.
 Mitanni, kings and inscriptions of, i, 411.
 Mit'atti, ii, 157, 159.
 Mitford, Edward Ledwich, i, 139.
 Mitinti, ii, 196, 199.
 Mohammed Pasha, i, 134, 143.
 Mohl, Julius, takes degree at Tübingen, and begins residence in Paris, i, 126; is a pupil of Silvestre de Saey, i, 126; becomes secretary of Société Asiatique, i, 126; visits London and sees inscribed bricks in East India House, i, 126; advises Botta to excavate in Assyria, i, 127; receives report of his success, i, 135; secretary of Société Asiatique, i, 225.
 Mordtmann, A. D., attempts to decipher Chaldian, i, 220; names second Persepolis language Susian, i, 178.
 Monuments, Babylonian, as sources, i, 254-257; their value, i, 257.
 Morocco, i, 139.
 Moschi, ii, 22.
 Mosul, i, 94, 127, 128, 130, 133, 134, 142, 143, 156, 169, 171, 232, 234.
 Muballitat-Sherua, i, 418.
 Mugheir, i, 161, 163, 172, 236, 290.
 Mühlbach, Captain von, finds inscription near Isoglu, i, 217.
 Mujelîb, i, 115.
 Mukallu, ii, 256.
 Mukayyer, see Mugheir.
 Müller, D. H., studies Chaldian texts, i, 223.
 Münter, Friedrich, identified builders of Persepolis with the Achamenides, i, 39; recognizes vowel "a" and consonant "b," i, 40; his work, i, 48.
 Morena, i, 283.
 Mosh, ii, 48.
 Mushezib-Marduk, ii, 209.
 Mushke, ii, 22, 23, 177.
 Musri, ii, 12, 28, 77, 79, 144.
 Mutakkil-Nusku, contemporary of Nebuchadrezzar I, i, 426; king of Assyria, ii, 18.
 Mutkinn, ii, 40, 44.
 Muttalu, ii, 168, 178.

N.

Nabonassar, ii, 132; weakness of his reign, ii, 109, 111.
 Nabonidus, king of Babylonia, his

work as a builder and an archæologist, ii, 359-363; the rebuilding of E-habbarra at Sippar, ii, 364, 365; rebuilding in Sippar and in Harran, ii, 365, 366; rebuilding of E-khulkhut at Harran, ii, 367, 368; his failure to prepare his empire for defense, ii, 373, 374, 376; his futile preparations, ii, 377; allusion to Hammurabi I, 317; allusion to Shagarakti-Buriash, i, 318; allusion to Naram-Sin, i, 318; restores temple in Larsa, i, 291.

Nabonidus Chronicle, i, 315.

Nabopolassar becomes king of Babylonia, ii, 299; his origin, ii, 305; his inscriptions, ii, 306-309; rule under the Assyrians, ii, 307; end of reign and its importance, ii, 314, 315.

Nabu (Nebo) i, 295.

Nabu-apal-iddin, king of Babylonia, restores temple at Sippar, ii, 58, 59.

Nabu-balatsnu-iqbi, ii, 358.

Nabu-bel-shume, ii, 270, 273.

Nabu-daian, king of Assyria, ii, 17.

Nabu-hadin-zer, ii, 132.

Nabu-nasir, see Nabonassar.

Nabu-shezib-anu, ii, 251.

Nabu-shum (or-nadin), king of Babylonia, i, 428.

Nabu-shum-eresh, ii, 260.

Nabu-shum-iskun, king of Babylonia, ii, 45, 109.

Nabu-shum-ukin, ii, 132, 133.

Nabu-ukin-abli, king of Babylonia, ii, 38, 39.

Nabu-usallim, ii, 220.

Nabu-ushabshi, ii, 134.

Nabu-ziru-kinish-lishir, ii, 319.

Nacibina, i, 300.

Nadin, ii, 135.

Naharina, i, 410. See also Mitanni.

Naturina, i, 269.

Nahum, i, 84, 258; ii, 289.

Na'id-Marduk, ii, 219,

Nahre-el-Kelb, ii, 44.

Nairi, ii, 27, 84, 93, 94, 118, 122.

Nakhiyeh of Harran, ii, 60.

Naksh-i-Rustam, i, 75.

Nal, ii, 118.

Namri, ii, 87, 95, 100, 112.

Nana, i, 291.

Nana-sakipat-tebi-sha, ii, 346.

Namnar, the moon god, i, 290.

Naphthali, ii, 129.

Naram-Sin, son of Sargon I, i, 365; records of his reign fragmentary, i, 366; his conquests and building operations, i, 366; his titles, i, 367; brick stamp of, found at Niffer, i, 241.

Natnu, ii, 276.

Nazibugash, king of Babylonia, i, 419.

Nazi-Maruttash, king of Babylonia, makes war on Adad-nirari I of Assyria, i, 421.

Nebuchadnezzar, see Nebuchadrezzar.

Nebuchadrezzar I, king of Babylonia, his brilliant reign, i, 426; contem-

porary of Mutakkil-Nusku, i, 426; and also of Asshur-rish-ishu, i, 426; conquests in the east, i, 427.

Nebuchadrezzar II, king of Babylonia, victory at Carchemish, ii, 313; becomes king, ii, 316; begins a siege of Jerusalem, ii, 318; takes the city, ii, 318, 319; a new rebellion in Palestine, ii, 320-324; Nebuchadrezzar begins another siege of Jerusalem, ii, 324; lifts siege and drives Egyptians under Hophra back, ii, 325-328; resumes the siege and takes the city, ii, 328, 329; judgment against Zedekiah, ii, 330; Jerusalem plundered and destroyed, ii, 331, 332; campaign against Tyre, ii, 336-338; invasion of Egypt, ii, 339, 340; his successes in war, ii, 341, 342; his building inscriptions, ii, 342; his rebuilding of the walls of Babylon, ii, 343-345; the repaving of streets, ii, 346; work upon temples, ii, 347; canal construction, ii, 347, 348; his pride in Babylon, ii, 349; work in Borsippa and other cities, ii, 349-351; significance of his reign, ii, 352, 353.

Neby Yunus, i, 129, 133, 140, 298.

Necho II, king of Egypt, ii, 231, 250; expedition into Asia, ii, 309-313; his second expedition and defeat at Carchemish, ii, 313.

Negub, ii, 71.

Nergal, i, 296.

Nergal-sharezer, ii, 215. See also Nergal-shar-usur.

Nergal-shar-usur, king of Babylonia, his early life and family connections, ii, 356; his brief reign, ii, 357, 358.

Nergal-ushezib, ii, 208.

Neriglissor, see Nerigal-shar-usur.

Nibarti-Asshur, ii, 60.

Niebuhr, Carsten, visits Persepolis, i, 34; his labors described by his son, i, 35; made many copies of inscriptions, i, 36; makes classification of cuneiform signs, i, 37; argues that the language was alphabetic, i, 37; visits Hillah, i, 104; visits Tigris mounds near Mosul i, 105.

Niffer, i, 161, 240.

Nigimkhi, ii, 9.

Nikshamuna, ii, 161.

Nikur, ii, 112.

Nile, i, 271, 273, 274.

Nimitti-Marduk, outer wall of Nippur, i, 366.

Nimitti-Bel, ii, 343.

Nimme, ii, 48.

Nimrod, i, 94, 96, 97, 140, 145, 148.

Nimroud, i, 140, 143, 153, 158, 235, 298.

Nineveh, i, 86, 88, 100, 101, 138; age of, ii, 1, 3; ii, 76.

Ninib-aplu-esharra referred to by Tiglath-pileser I, i, 326, 423; ii, 18.

Ninib-aplu-iddin, ii, 167.

Ninib-kudur-usur, king of Babylonia, ii, 36.

Ninth dynasty, chronology of, i, 345.
 Ninus, i, 94.
 Niphates, i, 270.
 Nippur, i, 293, 364, 366; ii, 109, 111.
 Nirbi, ii, 52, 113.
 Nirbu, ii, 53.
 Niriduris, i, 218.
 Nisan, i, 295.
 Nishtum, ii, 49.
 Nisibin (Nisibis, Naçibina), i, 300.
 Noah's ridge, i, 361.
 Noeturestand, see Nakshi-i-Rustam.
 Norris, Edwin, deciphers second column of Behistun text, i, 178.
 Numme, see Nimme.
 Nur-Adad, king of Larsa, i, 379.

O.

Odorie (Odorieus), journey to Cathay, i, 3; visits Comun, i, 4; man of little refinement, i, 4; influence of his narrative, i, 5; his testimony the first word in the dark, i, 5.
 Olearius, secretary to embassy of Duke of Holstein, i, 20.
 Olivier, Guillaume A., visits east, but makes only scant reference to Nineveh, i, 109.
 Omri, ii, 96.
 On, ii, 253.
 Onager, ii, 285.
 Onesikritos, i, 265.
 Onions, i, 282.
 Opis, i, 296.
 Oppert, Jules, sent to excavate at Birs Nimroud, i, 165; the collections lost in the Tigris, i, 165; makes contributions to the study of Susian, i, 179; is present at meeting of British Association in Glasgow, i, 193, 194; translates cylinder of Tiglathpileser, i, 196; tries to show the origin of Assyrian script, i, 202; uses the name Sumerian instead of Accadian, i, 203; contributes important grammatical studies of Accadian, i, 204; opposes Halévy, i, 209.
 Orehoë, i, 291, 292.
 Orontes, ii, 65, 75, 78, 118.
 Ortelius, Geographical Treasury, i, 93.
 Ortolan, i, 283.
 Osmin, i, 79.
 Osnappar, ii, 246. See also Assurbanapal.
 Ostrich, i, 283.
 Otter, Jean, begins a new age of exploration, i, 100; account of the ruins of Nineveh, i, 100, 101; visits Hillah, i, 101.
 Ox, i, 283.

P.

Padan, i, 404.
 Paddira, ii, 93.
 Padi, ii, 198, 199.
 Pa'e, ii, 273.
 Pakruru, ii, 250.
 Palaeographical indications for chronology, i, 322.

Palm, i, 282, 283.
 Palu, i, 218.
 Panammu, ii, 114, 121.
 Papa, ii, 158.
 Parikhia, ii, 258.
 Parsua, ii, 88, 94.
 Parthians, i, 301.
 Partridge, i, 283.
 Partukka, ii, 236.
 Patin, ii, 65, 75, 118.
 Pekah, ii, 127, 128, 129; name identified on Assyrian text, i, 228.
 Pekahiah, ii, 127.
 Pelicans, i, 283.
 Pennsylvania, University of, first expedition to Babylonia, i, 241; second campaign, i, 242, 243; third campaign, i, 243, 244; great success, i, 245; fourth campaign, i, 245; great success of this campaign, i, 246.
 Persepolis, i, 119, 120, 145.
 Persia, i, 3; climate of, i, 3.
 Persian, i, 139; modern language of, i, 10.
 Persian Gulf, i, 266.
 Pestilence destroys Sennacherib's army, ii, 202, 204; Egyptian tradition concerning it, ii, 387, 388.
 Peters, John P., member of American Oriental Society, i, 239; director of first Pennsylvania expedition, i, 240; his estimate of first campaign, i, 242; director of second campaign, i, 242.
 Pethachiah, Rabbi, of Ratisbon, i, 88.
 Pethor, ii, 40, 85.
 Petroleum, i, 288.
 Philistia, ii, 96.
 Phoenicia, ii, 75.
 Phoenicians, ii, 116.
 Piankhi, ii, 142.
 Pigeon, i, 283.
 Pisiris, ii, 114, 121.
 Pistachio, i, 282.
 Pitru, ii, 40, 44, 76.
 Plaee, Victor, i, 159.
 Plane tree, i, 282.
 Pognon, Henri, supports Halévy, i, 211.
 Political development of early Babylonia, i, 384, 385.
 Porcupine, i, 285.
 Poros, ii, 136.
 Porphyrius, i, 331.
 Porter, Sir Robert Ker, visits Rich at Baghdad, i, 121; had already visited Persepolis i, 121; his unusual endowments, i, 121; sketches the ruins of Babylon, i, 122; the account published in sumptuous style, i, 122; effect of the book, i, 23.
 Postelius, i, 21.
 Power, desire of, in early conquests, i, 351.
 Psammeticus ii, 251, 254.
 Ptolemy (Ptolemæus, Claudius), canon of, i, 333, 334.
 Pudi-ilu, king of Assyria, his conquests, ii, 9, 10.

Pukudu, ii, 109.

Pulu, ii, 138.

Pumpkins, i, 282.

Puqudu, ii, 174, 176.

Puri(lu) Sa-gale-e, eponym, i, 324.

Puzur-Asshur, contemporary of Burnaburiash I, i, 416; relations with Babylonia, i, 416; king of Assyria, ii, 6.

Q.

Qarqar, ii, 77, 78, 155, 156.

Qedesha, ii, 129.

Que, ii, 77, 79, 119, 121, 177.

Qumani, ii, 29.

Ququsaushu, ii, 115.

Qurkhe, ii, 24, 26, 27.

Qurkhi of Betani, ii, 49.

Qurkhi, ii, 56, 69.

R.

Rachmet, Mount, i, 3.

Rain, i, 279.

Rakkah, ii, 60.

Ramateya, ii, 236.

Raphia, ii, 156.

Rapikhu, see Raphia.

Rask, It., discovers plural ending in Persian, i, 58; also the phrase "king of lands," i, 58.

Rassam, Charles, British vice consul at Mosul, i, 154.

Rassam, Hormuzd, assists Layard, i, 154; sets out from England to assist him again, i, 157; sets out in 1854 to excavate at Kuyunjik, i, 166; his description of work on the northern mound at Kuyunjik, i, 166-170; discovers the deluge tablet, i, 170; finds the library of Assurbanipal i, 171; returns to England, i, 171; his work completed by Loftus, i, 171; sent out to Assyria in 1876, i, 234; successful excavations at Balawat, i, 235.

Ratisbon, i, 88.

Rawlinson, Sir Henry C., birth, i, 63; went to India and Persia, i, 63; reorganizes Persian army, i, 63; copies inscriptions at Hamadan, i, 63; begins to decipher, i, 64; method similar to Grotefend's, i, 64, 65; copies inscriptions at Behistun, i, 66; translates names and titles of Darius, i, 66; almost completes Persian alphabet, i, 67; preliminary memoir written in 1839, i, 67; sent to Afghanistan, i, 67; returns to Baghdad, i, 67; memoir published in 1846, i, 68; his dependence on others, i, 68, note; received Grotefend's results from Norris, i, 69; in correspondence with Burnouf and Lassen, i, 69; references to his work, i, 70; makes important discovery at Birs Nimroud, i, 172; his account of it, i, 172, 173; used by Norris of his copy of the Behistun text, i, 177, 178; discusses

the black obelisk, i, 188, 189; publishes the Babylonian text of the Behistun inscription, i, 190; translates cylinder of Tiglathpileser, i, 196; announces discovery of inscriptions in "Seythian," i, 201; tries to explain the Scythians as called Accadians in Babylonia, i, 202; attempts to read Chaldaean inscriptions, i, 219; presides at important meeting of Society of Biblical Archaeology, i, 229, 230.

Red-Amon, ii, 252.

Redcliffe, Lord Stratford de, i, 143.

Rediscovery of Babylonia, a twofold process, i, 2.

Religion, influence of, in early conquests, i, 350.

Rezin, ii, 121, 127, 128, 130, 131.

Rhine, i, 271.

Rib-Adda, letter of, found at Tell-el-Amarna, i, 249.

Riblah, ii, 329.

Rich, Claudius James, born in France, i, 113; has great readiness in learning languages, i, 113; becomes resident of the East India Company at Baghdad, i, 113; plans a book on the history of the Bagdad Pashalic, i, 114; visits Babylon, i, 114; his account of first visit to Babylon, i, 114; on first visit he planned and located the mounds, i, 115; description of his first diggings, i, 115; his first descriptions published at Vienna, i, 116; criticised by Major Rennell, i, 116; Rich visits mounds again, i, 116; in 1820 visits Mosul, i, 117; sketches and plans mounds of Neby Yunus, i, 117; surveys mound at Kuyunjik, i, 117; studies mound of Nimroud, i, 117; purchases inscriptions and sends a number to London, i, 118; visits Persepolis, i, 119; makes accurate copies of inscriptions, i, 120; death at Shiraz, i, 120; influence of his work, i, 120.

Rim-Anum, king of Elam, gains dominion in Babylonia, i, 380.

Rim-Sin, i, 381. See also Eri-Aku and Arioach.

Ri'raba, ii, 126.

Ri'sisu, ii, 126.

Robert, Louis de, unsuccessful attempts to decipher Chaldaean, i, 220, 221.

Rowandiz, Mount, ii, 49.

Royal Asiatic Society, i, 66, 68.

Royal inscriptions as sources, i, 256.

Royal Irish Academy, i, 71.

Ru'a, ii, 174.

Rukhubi, ii, 77.

Rukipti, ii, 196.

Rum-Kaleh, ii, 60.

Rusas, ii, 160, 162, 164, 165, 168.

S.

Sabaeans, i, 300.

Sachan, Eduard, leads expedition in Babylonia, i, 247.

Sacy, Silvestre de, deciphers Sasanian inscriptions, i, 43, 55.
 Sadikan, ii, 50.
 Saint Albert, Father Emanuel de, i, 101; describes remains of Babylon, i, 102, 103.
 Saint-Martin, Abbé, i, 56, 66.
 Sajur, i, 271.
 Saklowijeh Canal, i, 272.
 Salonica, i, 143.
 Sam'agunu, ii, 260.
 Samaria, i, 296; ii, 81, 119, 129, 140, 141, 144, 149, 150, 151, 155, 159.
 Samaritans, ii, 159.
 Sammuramat, ii, 99.
 Samsi, ii, 164.
 Samsu-iluna, king of Babylon, his reign, i, 394; tablets of, found at Sippar, i, 251.
 Samsusatana, i, 395.
 Samunu, ii, 210.
 Sanasana, ii, 236.
 Sandasharmie, ii, 256.
 Sand storms, i, 278.
 Sandstone, i, 288.
 Sangar, ii, 76.
 Sangura, ii, 65.
 Saniru, ii, 82.
 Sapia, ii, 134, 135.
 Saracos, see Sin-shar-ishkun.
 Sarati, ii, 258.
 Sarduri I, ii, 85, 86.
 Sarduri II, ii, 114, 115, 116, 159.
 Sargon I, cylinder of, found at Niffer, i, 241; legend concerning his youth, i, 362; astrological tablet relating to events in his reign, i, 363; the historical character of his reign, i, 363, 364; an inscription of his, i, 364; his campaigns, i, 365.
 Sargon II, king of Assyria, beginning of reign, ii, 148; fall of Samaria, ii, 149, 150; sources of history for his reign, ii, 150; his difficulties in Babylon, ii, 152-154; rebellions in the west, ii, 154-156; approaches toward Urartu, ii, 156, 157; conquest of Carchemish, ii, 157, 158; conquest of Papa and Lallukna, ii, 158, 159; direct attack upon Urartu, ii, 159-161; invasion of Media, ii, 162; difficulties with Rusas of Urartu, ii, 162, 163; expedition into Arabia, ii, 164; conquest of Urartu, ii, 164-166; campaigns in Media and Tabal, ii, 167, 168; war in Melidda, ii, 168; campaign against Philistia, ii, 169, 170; war upon Merodach-baladan, ii, 170-177; movements against the Mushké, ii, 177, 178; last campaigns, ii, 178, 179; works of peace, ii, 180, 181; estimate of his reign, ii, 181, 182.
 Sarabani, ii, 134.
 Sarzee, Ernest de, made French consul at Bassorah, i, 236; makes excavations at Telloh, i, 236; important results, i, 237, 238.
 Sassanian inscriptions deciphered by Silvestre de Saey, i, 43, 54; noticed by Hyde, i, 78.
 Saul, ii, 43.
 Sauley, F. de, works upon decipherment of Assyrian, i, 177; makes certain abortive attempts at decipherment, i, 186, 187.
 Sayee, Archibald Henry, writes two important papers on second class of Persepolis texts and names the language Anardian, i, 179; one of the founders of the Society of Biblical Archaeology, i, 199; gives most elaborate exegesis of Accadian text, i, 204; reviews Delitzsch's Assyrian dictionary, i, 213; deciphers Chaldean (Vannie), i, 222, 223; criticism of Herodotus, i, 263.
 Scheil, Father, director of Turkish expedition to Babylonia, i, 251.
 Schrader, Eberhard, avoids Accadian question, i, 206; later adopts name Accadian, i, 206; opposes Halévy, i, 209.
 Schulz, H. E., visits East to seek inscriptions, i, 81; searches for the summer city of Semiramis, i, 216; finds many inscriptions, i, 216, 217; murdered at Julameil, i, 82.
 Scythians, ii, 291. See also Manda.
 Sea Lands, country of, i, 267, 268; ii, 97; history of the dynasty of, ii, 35-37.
 Sebeneh-Su, ii, 45.
 Second dynasty, chronology of, i, 339, 340; history of, 395-397.
 Selamiyah, i, 147.
 Seleucid era, i, 328, 330.
 Semiramis, i, 96; ii, 99; Armenian tradition, i, 215, 216.
 Semites, their original home, various theories, i, 306.
 Senkereh, i, 290.
 Sennacherib, King of Assyria, sources of history, ii, 183; relations to Babylonia, ii, 184-186; rebellion in Babylonia, ii, 186-188; invasion of Babylonia, ii, 188-190; beginning of rebellion in the west, ii, 191-193; participation of Egypt, ii, 193, 194; rebellion begins in Ekron and extends to other western states, ii, 194, 195; authorities for the western campaign, ii, 194; invasion of the west, ii, 195-198; attempts to bring Jerusalem to surrender, ii, 199-201; his army destroyed by pestilence, ii, 202, 203; comparative failure of this expedition, ii, 204; difficulties in Babylonia, ii, 205, 206; campaign against the Chaldeans, ii, 207; Elamites invade Babylonia, ii, 208, 209; battle of Khalulé, ii, 210; destruction of Babylonia, ii, 211, 212; campaign into Arabia, ii, 213, 214; estimate of his reign, ii, 214, 215; allusion to Tiglath-pileser I, i, 320, 321, 325; allusion to Marduk-nadin-akhe, i, 320, 321, 325; allusion to Tukulti-Ninib, i, 325; brings a seal of Tukulti-Ninib from Babylonia, ii, 14.
 Septimia Colonia Nisibis, i, 300.
 Septimius Severus, i, 300.

Seri-Pul, i, 360.
 Seventh dynasty, chronology of, i, 344.
 Severek, ii, 52.
 Sha'alli, ii, 134.
 Shabaka, ii, 252.
 Shabara'in, ii, 139.
 Shagarakti-Shurash, king of Babylonia, i, 421.
 Shalmaneser I, king of Assyria, conquests, ii, 12; builds the city of Calah, ii, 13; contemporary of Kadashman-Buriash, i, 421.
 Shalmaneser II, king of Assyria, sources for his reign, ii, 72, 73; invasion of Bit-Adini, ii, 74; beginning of campaign against the west, ii, 75; his narrative of the first campaign, ii, 75-78; the course of this campaign, ii, 78; battle of Qarqar, ii, 79, 80; second invasion of the west, ii, 80; third invasion, ii, 81; later invasions, ii, 82; attacks upon Chaldia, ii, 83-86; campaigns in Nahrin and elsewhere in the east, ii, 87-89; campaign in Babylonia, ii, 89, 90; rebellion and close of his reign, ii, 90-92; obelisk found by Layard, i, 155; text of, deciphered by George Smith, i, 227.
 Shalmaneser III, king of Assyria, ii, 100, 101.
 Shalmaneser IV, records of his reign, ii, 139; the situation in the west at the beginning of his reign, ii, 140-144; Hoshea refuses tribute, ii, 144; Shalmaneser attacks Samaria, ii, 144-146; end of his reign, ii, 146, 147.
 Shamara'in, ii, 139.
 Shamash-ibni, ii, 220.
 Shamash-mudamnik, king of Babylonia, ii, 44.
 Shamash-shum-ukin, ii, 261-268.
 Shamshi-Adad, referred to by Tiglath-pileser I, i, 326.
 Shamshi-Adad I, king of Assyria, ii, 2; ii, 31; rebuilt temple in Nineveh, ii, 33.
 Shamshi-Adad II, ruler of Assyria, n.2.
 Shamshi-Adad IV, king of Assyria, his civil war, ii, 92; campaign into Nahrin, ii, 92; marches through Assyria, ii, 93, 94; tribute collecting and invasion of Babylonia, ii, 94, 95; end of his reign, ii, 95, 96; expedition lists from his reign, i, 324.
 Sharezer, see Nergalsharezer.
 Shar-gani-shar-ali, i, 361. See also Sargon I.
 Shargina, i, 361. See also Sargon I.
 Sharludari, ii, 250.
 Sharru-ludari, ii, 197.
 Shatt-el-Ilai, i, 236, 273, 291, 292.
 Sheep, i, 283.
 Shepa-sharru, ii, 161.
 Shirley, see Shirley.
 Shinar, i, 142.
 Sbmukhtu, ii, 157.
 Shiraz, i, 3, 8, 120.

Shirley, Anthony, description of Babylon, i, 92; and of Nineveh, i, 93; his interest in the ruins as illustrating the prophets, i, 93.
 Shirley, Sir Robert, member of suite of Sir D. Cotton, i, 18.
 Shirpur, i, 375; civilization of, i, 371.
 Shirwan, ii, 54.
 Shitir-parma, ii, 237.
 Shuandakhl, ii, 156.
 Shubari, ii, 9, 11.
 Shngardia, ii, 161.
 Shuhites, ii, 52, 57.
 Shulman-khaman-ilani, ii, 51.
 Shuma, ii, 51.
 Shushan, i, 8, 22.
 Shutur-nakhundi, ii, 174.
 Shu-nsh-shi, i, 396.
 Shuzigash (Nazibugash), i, 419.
 Sibar-shipak, king of Babylonia, ii, 35.
 Sibe, ii, 144, 156.
 Sibittibi'li, ii, 121.
 Sibraim, ii, 139.
 Sibyllines, the, i, 260.
 Sidon, ii, 67, 68, 81, 96, 124.
 Siduri, see Sarduris.
 Silanum-shukamuna, king of Babylonia, ii, 36.
 Silrus, i, 283.
 Simirra, ii, 155.
 Simplicius, commentary on Aristotle's *De Caelo*, i, 330.
 Sin, i, 290, 300.
 Sinai, i, 366.
 Sin-gashid, i, 378.
 Sin-idim, king of Larsa, i, 379.
 Sini of Dayani, ii, 28.
 Sin-muballit, i, 388, 395.
 Sin-shar-ishkun, king of Assyria, small knowledge of his reign, ii, 286, 287; his death, ii, 292.
 Sin-shum-lishir, king of Assyria, ii, 255.
 Sippar, ii, 36, 109, 111, 351.
 Sir-Pul, i, 361.
 Sivan, i, 324.
 Sixth dynasty, chronology of, i, 344.
 Sizu, ii, 225.
 Skuina, i, 218.
 Smith, R. Payne, i, 198.
 Smith, George, his early life, i, 226; his first discovery, i, 227; one of the early members of Society of Biblical Archaeology, i, 199; attempts to decipher Cypriote, i, 228; his edition of Asshurbanipal, i, 229; finds deluge tablet, i, 229; sent to Assyria by *Daily Telegraph*, i, 231; sent again by trustees of the British Museum, i, 232; sent out again in 1875, i, 233; his sufferings and death, i, 233.
 Snakes, i, 283.
 Somali, i, 306.
 Sterrett, J. R. S., member of Wolfe expedition, i, 239.
 Stone brought from Arabia, i, 286; brought from Lebanon and the Amanus, i, 286.
 Storks, i, 283.

String made from palm tree, i, 283.
 Sublime Porte, i, 135.
 Sugi, ii, 27.
 Suguma, ii, 84.
 Sukhi, ii, 93.
 Sukhme, ii, 86.
 Sulumal, ii, 114.
 Sumer, language of, i, 303; origin of the word, i, 373.
 Sumerians, the inventors of cuneiform writing, i, 304; their early history i, 305.
 Sumu-abu, king of Babylon, i, 387.
 Sumu-la-ilu, king of Babylon, i, 387.
 Sungir, i, 373.
 Supnati, ii, 45, 52.
 Suri, ii, 52.
 Suru, ii, 57.
 Suruji, ii, 60.
 Susa, i, 420.
 Susian, i, 178.
 Susiana, i, 399.
 Sutu, i, 419; ii, 10, 58, 176.
 Suzis or Shushan, i, 8.
 Swans, i, 283.
 Sylva y Figueroa, Garcia de, sent to court of Shah Abbas i, 11; writes letter to Marquess de Bedmar, i, 12; description of Persepolis, i, 12-15; displays more interest in men than in languages, i, 15; did not copy characters, i, 15; visits Babylon, i, 97.
 Syncellus, the, i, 328, 329.
 Synchonistic history, i, 324, 408, 413, 416.
 Syria, ii, 101.
 Syro-Ephraimitic war, ii, 128.

T.

Tablets, their manufacture, i, 287.
 Tables of chronology, i, 336-348.
 Talbot, H. Fox, proposes a plan for testing the decipherment of Assyrian, i, 194; his plan laid before Royal Asiatic Society, i, 195; and carried out, i, 196.
 Tamarisk, i, 282.
 Tandamani, ii, 252.
 Tanut-Amon, ii, 252.
 Tarbasu, ii, 134.
 Tarbis, ii, 244.
 Tarkhulara, ii, 114, 121, 168.
 Tarkhunazi, ii, 168.
 Tarku, i, 79, 80, 81, 82.
 Tash-shi-gurumash, i, 401.
 Tashzigurumash, i, 401, 402.
 Tavernier, Jean Baptiste, at Persepolis, i, 25.
 Taylor, J. E., sent to excavate at Mugheir, i, 163; his account of his work, i, 163, 164; also excavates at Abu Sharein and Tell-el-Lahm, i, 164.
 Teheran, i, 65.
 Tela, ii, 52.
 Tell Ibrahim, i, 296.
 Tell-Id, i, 291.

Tell-i-Toubah, hill of repentance, i, 101.
 Telloh, i, 236, 235.
 Temperature of Babylonia, i, 277.
 Tenotamon, see Tanut-Amon.
 Testament, Old, as chronological source, i, 335; as historical source, i, 257, 258.
 Thaïs, i, 15.
 Thevenot, i, 78, 79.
 Third dynasty, chronology of, i, 340-342.
 Thrush, i, 283.
 Thutmosis III invades Asia, ii, 4.
 Tibareni, ii, 23.
 Tidal, king of Goiim, i, 391.
 Tiglathpileses I, king of Assyria, ii, 19, 20; sources for his reign, ii, 21; his gods, ii, 21, 22; campaign against the Mushke, ii, 22, 23, 24; establishes supremacy in Kummukh, ii, 24, 25, 26; wars in Shubari, ii, 25; wars against Kharia and Qurkhi, ii, 26; campaign into Nairi, ii, 27, 28; against Arameans, ii, 28; against Musri, ii, 28, 29; his summary of first five campaigns, ii, 29; invasions of Babylonia, ii, 30; his works of peace, ii, 30, 31; career as a sportsman, ii, 31; importance of his reign, ii, 32; allusions to Shamshi-Adad, Ishme-Dagan, Asshurdan, and Ninib-apal-esarra, i, 326; cylinder of, used for test of decipherment, i, 194-196.
 Tiglathpileses II, king of Assyria, ii, 44.
 Tiglathpileses III, king of Assyria, his ancestry, ii, 104; his civil and military ability, ii, 105; his inscription, ii, 106, 107; his first campaign directed against Babylonia, ii, 108, 109; his new form of civil administration, ii, 110, 111; campaigns in the east, ii, 111, 112; campaigns in the north, ii, 112-115; effects of the conquest of Sarduris II, ii, 115, 116; reduction of Arpad, ii, 117, 118; campaign into lands of Nairi, ii, 118, 119; successful campaign against the west, and especially against Israel, ii, 119-122; rebellions in the east, ii, 122, 123; attack upon Urartu (Chaldia), ii, 123; campaign to Mediterranean coast, ii, 124-126; desire to attack hill country of Palestine, ii, 126; the Syro-Ephraimitic war, ii, 127, 128; the interference of Tiglathpileses, ii, 129; conquest of Damaseus, ii, 130-132; campaigns in Babylonia, ii, 132-137; end of his reign, ii, 137; estimate of his reign, ii, 138, 139.
 Tigris, i, 86, 90, 100, 128, 129, 140; source, i, 270; its course, i, 271-273; ii, 76.
 Til-sha-apli-akhi, ii, 76.
 Tirhqa, ii, 203, 249, 250, 252.
 Tonetti, Joseph, i, 172.
 Toy, C. H., member of the American Oriental Society, i, 239.

Trebizond, i, 157.
 Trinity College, i, 71.
 Tripolis, ii, 67.
 Tubal, ii, 23.
 Tudehula, son of Gazza, i, 391.
 Tukhan, ii, 121.
 Tukulti-Asshur-Bel, king of Assyria, ii, 17.
 Tukulti-Ninib, king of Assyria, ii, 13; conquers Babylonia, ii, 14; i, 422; sent a seal to Babylonia, which was secured by Sennacherib, ii, 14; his reign ends in a rebellion, ii, 15.
 Tukulti-Ninib II, king of Assyria, ii, 45.
 Tun, see Atun.
 Turkish language, i, 205; expedition to Sippar, i, 250, 251.
 Turnat, ii, 54.
 Turtledove, i, 283.
 Turuki, ii, 9.
 Turnspa, ii, 123.
 Tuska, ii, 53, 56.
 Tutammu, ii, 117.
 Tychsen, Olav Gerhard, studies Niebuhr's copies of Persepolis inscriptions, i, 38; discovers dividing sign between words, i, 38; saw that the inscriptions were trilingual, i, 38; made erroneous translation, i, 39.
 Tyre, ii, 67, 68, 81, 96, 119, 121, 124, 146, 336.

U.

Uaite, ii, 275.
 Ugaru, ii, 378, 379.
 Ugro-finnic, i, 205.
 Ukinzer, ii, 133, 134, 135.
 Ukush of Gishban, i, 354.
 Ulluba, ii, 118, 120.
 Ullusumu, ii, 160, 163, 167.
 Ummandalash, ii, 219, 221, 270, 274.
 Ummangash, ii, 260, 266.
 Ummanninamu, ii, 209-210.
 Unqi, ii, 117, 120.
 Uperi, ii, 177.
 Upi, i, 296; ii, 378.
 Uppis, ii, 236.
 Ur, the remarkable location of the city, i, 371, 372; its earliest known king, i, 372. Also i, 290; ii, 351.
 Ural-altaic family, i, 205.
 Urartu, ii, 45, 83, 84, 85, 86, 88, 97, 100, 113, 115, 116, 118, 119, 123, 156.
 Ur-Ba'u, *patesi* of Shirkurla, his reign, i, 368, 369; king, i, 384.
 Urdamani, ii, 252.
 Ur-Gur, king of Ur, i, 373; king of Sumer and Accad, i, 373; a great builder, i, 374; builds walls of Nippur, i, 375.
 Urikki, ii, 121.
 Urimmi, ii, 121.
 Urkagina, i, 291.
 Ur-Nina, king of Sungir, i, 356, 357.
 Urningirsu, i, 371.
 Ur-Ninib, i, 376.
 Urrakhinash, ii, 24.
 Urtaki, ii, 259.

Ur-Azag, dynasty of, i, 395-397.
 Uruk, i, 291, 292, 351.
 Urukagina, king of Shirkurla, his building works, i, 356.
 Urnmaliki, ii, 196.
 Urumiyeh, ii, 45, 88, 94; Lake, ii, 113.
 URU-MU-USU, i, 359.
 Urns, i, 285.
 Urzana, ii, 165.
 Ushu, ii, 277.
 Uzziah, ii, 119, 120, 126, 128.

V.

Vaidae, i, 94.
 Valle, Pietro della, traveled in Turkey, Persia, and India, i, 16; wrote letters to Mario Schipano, i, 16; visited Persepolis, i, 16; copy of signs, i, 16; decided that ancient Persian should be read from left to right, i, 17; visits Babylon, i, 97.
 Van, inscription of Xerxes, i, 67; ii, 123; Lake, ii, 27, 29, 32, 48, 84.
 Vannie texts copied and deciphered, i, 215-224. See also Chaldian.
 Varto, ii, 48.
 Vashti, i, 8.
 Venice dispatches envoy to count of Uzun Cassan, i, 5.
 Vetches, i, 282.
 Vine, i, 282.

W.

Walnut, i, 282.
 Ward, William Hayes, director of Wolf expedition, i, 239; his final report, i, 240.
 Warka, i, 161, 292.
 Werdi, i, 272.
 Westergaard, Niels Louis, recopies inscriptions at Persepolis, i, 61; visits Naksh-i-Rustam, i, 62; his work known to Hineks, i, 71; lays foundation for reading second class of Persepolis inscription, i, 176; he calls the language Median and uses a method similar to Grotefend's, i, 176; his work criticised by Hineks, i, 176; further work of his, i, 178.
 Wheat indigenous to Babylonia, i, 282.
 Whewell, i, 196.
 Wild-cat, i, 285.
 Wilkinson, Sir Gardner, ii, 196.
 Williams, W. F., i, 160.
 Wilson, H. H., i, 196.
 Witzen, copies Flower's texts and curious explanation of their origin, i, 79, 80; his narratives used by others, i, 81.
 Wolfe, Catherine Lorillard, gives five thousand dollars for exploring expedition in Babylonia, i, 239.
 Wright, Thomas, i, 87.

X.

Xerxes, i, 52, 54, 56, 65, 67.
 Xiria, i, 12.

Y.

Yabullu, ii, 134.
Yakinlu, ii, 255.
Yalmun, Mount, ii, 44.
Ya'lu, ii, 233.
Yanzu, ii, 87, 88, 163.
Yasubigallu, ii, 190.
Yata', ii, 233.
Yatburu, ii, 174.
Ya-ubidi, ii, 154, 155, 156.
Yauta, ii, 275.
Yezd, i, 3.

Z.

Zab, lower, i, 272; ii, 66, 71, 87.
Zab, upper, i, 272; ii, 102.

Zab-Dadi, ii, 54.
Zabibi, ii, 130.
Zabu, king of Babylon, i, 387, 395.
Zaddi, ii, 93.
Zagros, i, 272, 361, 399.
Zakiru, ii, 134.
Zalebiyeh, ii, 60.
Zamashumiddin, king of Babylon, i, 424.
Zedekiah, ii, 319, 329, 330, 331.
Zend-Avesta, i, 42.
Zenobia, ii, 60.
Zibia, ii, 161.
Zidqa, ii, 197, 204.
Zil-bal, ii, 199.
Zinumern, H., opposes Halévy, i, 212.
Zor, ii, 60.

INDEX OF AUTHORS QUOTED OR REFERRED TO.

A.

Abel, ii, 92, 99, 183, 214, 216, 342.
Aberdare, Lord, i, 138.
Abulfeda, i, 100.
Abydenus, i, 329; ii, 292, 307.
Ælian, ii, 372.
Ainsworth, i, 289, 297.
Alexander Polyhistor, i, 259, 260.
Amiand, i, 356, 357, 369; ii, 73.
Anville, d', i, 103.
Arrian, i, 265.
Asher, A., i, 87.
Aston, F., i, 74.

B.

Ball, ii, 202, 342, 392.
Barbaro, Josophat, i, 6, 7.
Barmstark, i, 294; ii, 391.
Bayer, i, 80, 81.
Beauchamp, Abbé, i, 108.
Beer, i, 83.
Belck, i, 224; ii, 88, 117, 158.
Belsler, ii, 38.
Benjamin of Tudela, i, 86.
Benzinger, ii, 77, 127, 194, 203.
Berossos, ii, 202, 340, 351, 355, 358.
Bezold, i, 212, 214, 402; ii, 14, 183, 189, 212, 246, 343, 356, 386, 387.
Billerbeck, i, 399, 405; ii, 49, 54, 55, 210, 273, 291, 389.
Black, i, 387.
Blunt, i, 277.
Bonomi, i, 136.
Boscawen, i, 233.
Botta, i, 137, ff., 185, 299; ii, 150.
Brandis, ii, 200.
Brinton, i, 306.
Bruin, Cornelis de, i, 31.
Bry, frères de, i, 97.
Budde, i, 269.
Budge, i, 248; ii, 216, 356.
Bourouil, Eugène, i, 58, 82.

C.

Cartwright, i, 94, 95.
Cesnola, i, 367.
Chardin, i, 24, II.
Churchill, i, 28.
Chesney, i, 271, 274, 281, 288, 289, 296.
Cheyne, i, 387; ii, 204, 337.
Cordier, i, 4.
Craig, i, 425; ii, 72.
Curtius, Q., i, 12.

D.

Deecke, i, 210.
Delattre, ii, 29, 48, 289.
Delitzsch, i, 206, 209, 213, 234, 247, 248, 362, 379, 399, 401, 402, 413, 421, 426; ii, 7, 12, 47, 64, 67, 7, 187, 258, 384, 386.
Diels, i, 331.
Dieulafoy, Mme., i, 4.
Diodorus, i, 12, 262, 328, 332.
Donner, i, 303.
Driver, i, 390, 391; ii, 82.

E.

Eldred, i, 89, 90.
Eusebius, i, 260, 262, 328; ii, 204, 338, 351, 355.
Evets, ii, 286, 299, 383.

F.

Fitch, i, 90.
Floegl, i, 329.
Flower, i, 74, ff.
Frähm, i, 80.

G.

Gemelli-Carreri, i, 25, ff.
Giesebrrecht, ii, 321, 341.
Glaser, ii, 164.
Gouveia, Antonio de, i, 7-10.

Grey, i, 17.
 Grönay, i, 21.
 Grotfend, i, 47, ff.
 Grünewald, i, 210.
 Guidi, i, 306.
 Guthe, ii, 42, 151, 203, 332.
 Gutschmid, von, i, 328, 329.
 Guyard, i, 211, 221.

H.

Hagen, ii, 361, 371, 374, 375, 378.
 Hager, i, 110.
 Hakluyt, i, 4, 91.
 Halévy, i, 207, ff., 217, 303, 305; ii, 139.
 Halma Abbé, i, 334.
 Harper, ii, 216.
 Hastings, i, 316, 321; ii, 258.
 Haupt, i, 211; ii, 210, 354.
 Havers, i, 17.
 Haynes, i, 367.
 Heeren, i, 55.
 Helmolt, ii, 385.
 Herberg, i, 331.
 Herbert, i, 18, ff.
 Hermann, i, 303.
 Herodotus, ii, 22, 202, 203, 311, 337, 339, 345, 372, 373, 387, 388, 389.
 Heuzey, i, 211, 293, 357, 368, 371, 387.
 Hieronymus, ii, 202.
 Hieronymus of Kardia, i, 265.
 Hilprecht, i, 242, 244, 245, 246, 251, 316, 321, 334, 355, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 364, 366, 371, 372, 376, 377, 395, 396, 399, 401, 417, 420, 421, 426, 427; ii, 283, 299, 336.
 Hineks, i, 182, ff., 192, 193, 194, 195, 202, 218.
 Holzmann, i, 62, 83.
 Hommel, i, 210, 303, 306, 316, 319, 333, 339, 340, 351, 363, 364, 371, 390, 396, 422; ii, 5, 12, 51, 59, 99, 109, 204, 298, 383, 384, 385.
 Hörring, ii, 183.
 Hyde, i, 77.
 Hyslop, i, 171.

J.

Jastrow, i, 306; ii, 386.
 Jensen, i, 212, 310, 356, 357, 368, 370, 392, 402, 411, 425; ii, 246, 252, 253, 255, 257, 258, 259, 269, 270, 273, 276, 277.
 Jeremias, A., ii, 291.
 Jeremias, J., ii, 59.
 Jones, i, 171, 172.
 Josephus, i, 260; ii, 327, 337, 340, 351.
 Justin, ii, 338.

K.

Kaempfer, i, 29, ff.
 Kaulen, i, 185; ii, 383, 386.
 Keane, i, 303.
 King, i, 387, 389, 390, 391; ii, 286, 298, 299, 384.
 Kittel, ii, 77, 194, 201.

Knudtzon, i, 313, 343, 401, 414; ii, 38, 39, 216, 229, 234, 235.
 Krall, i, 306, 385.
 Koldevey, i, 248.
 Kosters, i, 390.
 Ktesias, ii, 373.

L.

Lassen, i, 61.
 Lauer, i, 216.
 Layard, i, 139, 142, 144, ff., 244, 299; ii, 47, 51, 70, 71, 72, 107, 150, 183, 284.
 Ledrain, ii, 387.
 Le Gac, i, 368.
 Lehmann, i, 214, 223, 224, 310, 313, 316, 319, 320, 321, 330, 377, 378, 380, 387, 399, 401, 417; ii, 117, 159, 262.
 Lenormant, i, 204, 205, 209, 219, 303; ii, 12, 187.
 Lhotzky, ii, 47.
 Lineke, ii, 294, 387.
 Loftus, i, 161, 281, 289, 290, 292.
 Longperier, i, 183.
 Löwenstein, i, 181.
 Luschans, von, ii, 216, 227.
 Lyon, ii, 150.

M.

Mariette, ii, 202.
 Marti, ii, 337.
 Martinet, i, 87.
 Maspero, i, 357; ii, 48, 49, 52, 55, 60, 78, 187, 204, 233, 330, 385.
 Mayhoff, i, 332.
 McClure, ii, 385.
 McCurdy, i, 309; ii, 204, 386.
 McGee, ii, 343.
 Meinhold, ii, 199, 204.
 Meissner, i, 387, 427; ii, 21, 218, 273.
 Menander, ii, 338.
 Ménant, ii, 29, 383.
 Messerschmidt, ii, 355, 358.
 Meyer, i, 307; ii, 29, 187, 199, 258, 386.
 Millin, i, 106, 112.
 Mitford, i, 139.
 Moerbeka, i, 331.
 Mohl, i, 133.
 Moore, i, 269.
 Mordtmann, i, 320, 222.
 Morgan, de, i, 360.
 Moses of Chorene, i, 216.
 Mühlbach, von, i, 217.
 Müller, C., i, 280.
 Müller, F. Max, i, 68, 190.
 Müller, W. Max, i, 269.
 Müller-Didot, ii, 207, 292, 307, 338, 358, 369, 373, 391.
 Mürdter, i, 319; ii, 187, 384.
 Muss-Arnolt, W., ii, 387.

N.

Niebuhr, C., i, 250.
 Niebuhr, Carsten, i, 36, 104.
 Nikel, i, 264.
 Nöldeke, i, 306.
 Norris, i, 178; ii, 139, 196.

O.

Odoric, i, 4.
 Olearius, i, 20.

Olivier, i, 109, 281, 282.
 Oppert, i, 165, 179, 200, 295, 399; ii, 144,
 150, 297, 387.
 Ortelius, i, 93.
 Ortellius, i, 93.
 Otter, i, 100, 101.

P.

Peiser, i, 325, 329, 365, 378, 387, 413; ii,
 10, 31, 36, 38, 43, 47, 54, 59, 72, 139,
 150, 356, 387.
 Peters, i, 240, 241, 242, 278, 289, 290, 292,
 293, 294; ii, 60.
 Petrie, i, 248; ii, 4, 5.
 Pinches, i, 313, 314, 315, 390, 391, 401,
 419; ii, 59, 73, 187, 361.
 Pliny, i, 331, 332.
 Plutarch, i, 12.
 Pognon, i, 211; ii, 183, 330, 342.
 Polyhistor, Alexander, ii, 189.
 Poole, i, 70.
 Porter, i, 122.
 Price, i, 369.
 Prince, ii, 351.
 Ptolemæus, ii, 102.
 Purchas, i, 21, 91.

R.

Ramusio, i, 5.
 Rask, i, 58.
 Rassam, i, 167, ff., 206, 297, 298; ii, 59, 70,
 73, 246, 253, 255, 257, 258, 265, 267,
 268, 269, 271, 276, 277.
 Rawlinson, G., i, 64; ii, 29, 388, 391.
 Rawlinson, H. C., i, 173, 188, 190, 201,
 202, 210, 361; ii, 51, 53, 131, 144.
 Renan, i, 306.
 Rich, i, 115, ff., 288.
 Robert, i, 220.
 Rodwell, ii, 47.
 Rogers, i, 294, 399; ii, 78, 82, 183, 189,
 190, 194, 195, 196, 200, 202, 206, 209,
 231, 347, 384.
 Rost, i, 316, 317, 318, 320, 321, 328, 330,
 331, 399, 419, 420, 425; ii, 107, 109, 110,
 115, 118, 125, 218.

S.

Sachau, i, 290, 291, 294, 297, 300; ii, 60,
 64.
 Saint-Martin, i, 56, 82.
 Sayee, A. H., i, 178, 218, 221, 222, 230,
 249, 263, 307, 313, 338, 361, 377, 380,
 387, 396, 399, 405; ii, 21, 24, 28, 31, 33,
 47, 48, 52, 54, 64, 67, 82, 113, 238, 277,
 297, 338, 384, 385, 386.
 Scheil, i, 251, 360, 390; ii, 4, 11, 72, 73,
 84, 299.
 Schermann, ii, 387.
 Schoene, i, 259, 328.
 Schrader, i, 206, 209, 307, 313, 323, 324,
 381; ii, 2, 12, 21, 29, 64, 65, 77, 79,
 107, 139, 187, 216, 258, 268, 297, 351,
 374, 387.

Schulz, i, 217.
 Schwartz, i, 332.
 Sherley, i, 92.
 Skene, ii, 64.
 Smith, George, i, 227, 228, 314, 319, 362,
 363, 373; ii, 14, 18, 246, 256, 297, 384.
 Smith, George Adam, ii, 198, 202.
 Smith, Samuel Alden, i, 427; ii, 246, 255.
 Stade, ii, 144, 194.
 Stevenson, i, 264.
 Steindorff, i, 248; ii, 5, 252.
 Strabo, ii, 277, 338.
 Strassmeier, ii, 306, 308, 356.
 Streck, ii, 26, 27.
 Strong, ii, 33, 167.
 Sylva y Figueiroa, i, 11-15.

T.

Talbot, i, 195, 196, 199, 362; ii, 183, 196.
 Taylor, i, 163, 164.
 Thureau-Dangin, i, 367, 377.
 Tiele, i, 33, 307, 319; ii, 26, 29, 84, 99,
 109, 298, 329, 338, 355, 384.
 Tobin, i, 299.
 Tolman, i, 264.
 Tomkins, i, 367; ii, 118.
 Tudela. Benjamin of, i, 86.
 Tychsen, i, 38.

V.

Valle, P. de, i, 16.

W.

Ward, i, 239, 293.
 Weissbach, i, 179, 200, 206, 207, 390.
 Westergaard, i, 176, 178.
 Wilson, ii, 64.
 Wimmer, i, 280.
 Winckler, H., i, 250, 307, 314, 316, 324,
 325, 333, 334, 360, 363, 364, 373, 378,
 379, 381, 392, 395, 399, 401, 403, 404,
 411, 413, 414, 419, 420, 426; ii, 2, 6,
 7, 12, 17, 21, 38, 44, 45, 65, 72, 77, 99,
 109, 144, 146, 150, 154, 156, 157, 158,
 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 169,
 172, 173, 176, 179, 181, 183, 187, 200,
 203, 204, 216, 217, 231, 233, 246, 248,
 252, 278, 283, 286, 289, 298, 299, 306,
 308, 309, 330, 342, 343, 347, 348, 349,
 384, 385.

Witsen, i, 79, 80.

Wright, i, 87.

X.

Xenophon, ii, 293, 372, 375.

Y.

Yule, i, 4.

Z.

Zimmern, i, 212, 369, 390, 418.

INDEX OF BIBLICAL PASSAGES QUOTED OR DISCUSSED.

OLD TESTAMENT.

GENESIS.

x, 2, ii, 22; x, 10, i, 205; xi, i, 356; xxiv, 10, i, 269.

NUMBERS.

xxii, 5, ii, 40.

DEUTERONOMY.

iii, 9, ii, 82; xxiii, 4, ii, 40; xxiii, 5, i, 260.

JOSHUA.

xix, 45, ii, 197.

JUDGES.

iii, 8, i, 269.

I SAMUEL.

iv, 1-11, ii, 322.

II SAMUEL.

x, 6, 8, ii, 275.

I KINGS.

xi, 23, ii, 275.

II KINGS.

viii, 7-15, ii, 81; xv, 19, 20, ii, 120; xv, 29, ii, 129; xv, 30, ii, 129; xvi, 6, ii, 128; xvi, 7, ff., ii, 128; xvi, 9, ii, 131; xvi, 10, ii, 127; xvii, 4, ii, 144; xvii, 6, ii, 151; xviii, 8, ii, 192; xviii, 9, 10, ii, 146; xviii, 14, ii, 200; xviii, 17, ii, 201; xix, 7, 9, ii, 202; xix, 9-14, ii, 202; xix, 32-35, ii, 203; xix, 36, 37, ii, 215; xix, 37, ii, 217; xx, 20, ii, 192; xxii, 12, ii, 127; xxiii, 29, ii, 311; xxiv, 1, ii, 317; xxiv, 7, ii, 313; xxiv, 8, ii, 318; xxiv, 17, ii, 319; xxv, 4, 5, ii, 329; xxv, 22, ii, 332; xxv, 26, ii, 333; xxv, 27, ii, 354.

II CHRONICLES.

xxxii, 5, ii, 192; xxxv, 20-22, ii, 311.

EZRA.

iv, 3, ii, 159; iv, 10, ii, 246.

PSALMS.

xxxvii, 4, ii, 335.

ISAIAH.

x, 9, ii, 121; xx, 1, ii, 169; xxii, 9, 10, ii, 201; xxx, 1-4, ii, 194; xxxi, 1, ii, 194; xxxvi, 6, ii, 328; xxxvii, 25, ii, 228; xlii, 14, ii, 337.

JEREMIAH.

xxii, 24, ii, 318; xxiv, 1, ii, 318; xxvii, 1-3, ii, 321; xxvii, 20, ii, 318; xxvii, ii, 323; xxix, 5-7, ii, 335; xxix, ii, 325; xxxvii, 1, ii, 319; xxxvii, 7, 8, ii, 326, 327; xxxvii, 9, 10, ii, 325; xxxvii, 11-15, ii, 326; xxxvii, 19, ii, 322; xxxviii, 2, ii, 328; xxxix, 2, ii, 331; xl, 5-7, ii, 332; xl, 13-xli, 15, ii, 333; xli, 16-18, ii, 324; xlii, ii, 334; xlvi, 1-7, ii, 334; xlvi, 2, ii, 313; xl ix, 34-38, ii, 341; lii, 31, ii, 354.

EZEKIEL.

i, 2, ii, 318; xvii, 11-21, ii, 330; xxvii, 13, ii, 22; xxxviii, 2, ii, 22, 258; xlvi, 16, ii, 139.

DANIEL.

iv, 30, ii, 349; iv, 31, ii, 351; v, 1, 26, 31, ii, 363.

AMOS.

vi, 2, ii, 121.

NAHUM.

iii, 9, ii, 289.

ZEPHANIAH.

ii, 13-15, ii, 293.

APOCRYPHA.

ECCLESIASTICUS.

i, 25, 26, ii, 159.

NEW TESTAMENT.

LUKE,

ix, 52, 53, ii, 159.

JOHN.

iv, 9, ii, 159.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

University of California Library
Los Angeles

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

AUG 01 REC'D :00 AM REC'D C.L. JAN 10 '00

REC'D YRL DEC 02 2002

Y 2 A '97
315

3 1158 00190 4159

